

भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 10]
No. 10]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, मार्च 4, 1972/फल्गुन 14, 1893
NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1972/PHALGUNA 14, 1893

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ क्षेत्र प्रशासन को छोड़कर) केन्द्रीय प्राधिकरणों द्वारा जारी
किये गए विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएँ।

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administration of Union Territories).

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 25th January 1972

S.O. 760.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 70, dated the 16th December, 1970 the Central Government hereby exempts (1) Mourigram Installation (Marketing Division), P.O. Radhadasi, District Howrah, and (2) Dum Dum Aviation Fuel Station (Marketing Division) Dum Dum Airport, Calcutta, belonging to Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., from all the provisions of the said Act for a period of one year with effect from the 2nd January 1972 upto and inclusive of 1st January, 1973

[No. 602(22)/70-HI.]

श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय

(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 25 जनवरी, 1972

का० आ० 760.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 87 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम रोजगार और पुनर्वास

मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 70 तारीख 16 दिसम्बर, 1970 के क्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा :—

- (1) इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड के मोरी ग्राम इंस्टालेशन (मार्केटिंग डिविजन) डाकघर—राधा दासी, जिला हावड़ा, और
- (2) डम डम एविएशन फ्यूल स्टेशन (मार्केटिंग डिविजन) डम डम एयर पोर्ट, कलकत्ता

को उक्त अधिनियम के सभी उपबंधों से 2 जनवरी 1972 से 1 जनवरी 1973 तक, यह दिन भी सम्मिलित करके एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए छूट देती है।

(सं० फा० 602(22)/70-एच० आई०]

New Delhi, the 1st February 1972

S.O. 761.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Family Pension Fund Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri D. V. Soni to be an Inspector for the whole of the Union territory of Delhi for the purposes of the said Act and of the Scheme or the family pension Scheme framed thereunder in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the

Central Government or in relation to any establishment connected with a railway company, a major port, a mine or an oilfield or a controlled industry.

[No. 21/5/68-PF.I.]

नई दिल्ली, 1 फरवरी 1972

का० प्रा० 761.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और कुटुम्ब पेंशन निधि अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) की धारा 13 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री डी० बी० सोनी को उक्त अधिनियम और उसके अधीन विरचित किसी स्कीम के प्रयोजनों के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के या उसके नियंत्रणाधीन किसी स्थापन के लिए सम्बन्ध में या किसी रेल कम्पनी महापत्तन खान या तेल क्षेत्र या नियंत्रित उद्योग से सम्बन्धित किसी स्थापन के सम्बन्ध में सम्पूर्ण दिल्ली संघ क्षेत्र के लिए निरीक्षक नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 21(5)/68-पी०एफ०-1]

S.O. 762.—Whereas the State Government of Rajasthan has, in pursuance of clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), nominated Dr. R. L. Chopra, Deputy Director, Medical and Health Services (Employees State Insurance) Government of Rajasthan to be a member of the Medical Benefit Council in place of Dr. B. M. Sharma;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), No. S.O. 3680, dated the 21st August, 1971, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading "[Nominated by the State Governments concerned under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10]", for the entry against item (16), the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"Dr. R. L. Chopra, Deputy Director, Medical and Health Services, (Employees State Insurance), Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur."

[No. F. U-16012/12/71-HL.]

का० प्रा० 762.—यतः राजस्थान राज्य सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अनुसरण में श्री डा० आर० एल० चोपड़ा, उप-निदेशक, को श्री चिकित्सीय तथा स्वास्थ्य सेवाएं (कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा), राजस्थान सरकार को डा० बी० एम० शर्मा प्रसूविधा परिषद के सदस्य के रूप में नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है;

अतः अब, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 3680 तारीख 21 अगस्त, 1971 में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में "(संबन्धित सरकारों द्वारा धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट)" शीर्षक

के नीचे मद (16) के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

"डा० आर० एल० चोपड़ा,

उप-निदेशक, चिकित्सीय तथा स्वास्थ्य सेवाएं,

(कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा), राजस्थान सरकार, जयपुर।"

[सं० फा० यू-16012/12/71-एच०प्राई०]

New Delhi, the 3rd February 1972

S.O. 763.—In pursuance of clause (d) of sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 4 of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. L. Subbiah as a member of the Regional Committee set up for the State of Tamil Nadu and makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour No. SRO. 3381, dated the 2nd November, 1954, namely:—

In the said notification, for entry 7, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"7. Shri P. L. Subbiah, General Secretary, National Textiles Workers' Trichy Road, Ramanathapuram, Coimbatore."

[No. 12/8/54-PF.II.]

नई दिल्ली, 3 फरवरी, 1972

का० प्रा० 763.—कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि स्कीम, 1952 के पैरा 4 के उपपैरा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री पी० एल० सुब्बयाह को तमिलनाडु राज्य के लिए स्थापित प्रादेशिक समिति का एक सदस्य नियुक्त करती है और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० नि० प्रा० 3381 तारीख 2 नवम्बर, 1954 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन और करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में प्रविष्टि 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जायेगी, अर्थात् :—

"7. श्री पी० एल० सुब्बयाह,

महासचिव, नेशनल टैक्स्टाइल वर्कर्स यूनियन,

त्रिचि रोड, रामनाथपुरम्, कोयम्बटूर।"

[सं० 12(8)/64-पी०एफ० 2]

S.O. 764.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 649, dated the 29th January, 1971 the Central Government having regard to the location of the factories mentioned in the Schedule below in the State of Tamil Nadu in which the provisions of Chapters IV and V of the said Act are not in force, hereby exempts the said factories from the payment of employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from the date of expiry of the period specified in the said notification or until the enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in those areas, whichever is earlier.

THE SCHEDULE

1. Special Maintenance Sub-Division Workshops Compound, Mettur Dam.

2. Meter and Relay Testing Section, Cross Cut Road, Coimbatore-12.
3. Meter and Relay Tests and Telephone Section, 8-81 East Main Road, Mettur Dam.
4. Udampalpet Sub-Section, Tiruppar Road, Udampalpet, Coimbatore District.
5. Special Maintenance Laboratory, Control Rooms & M.R.T. Section/Pasumalai, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Pasumalai, Madurai-17.
6. Papanasam Power House, Papanasam Project P. O., Tirunelveli District.
7. Special Maintenance Repair Shed Cross Cut Road, Tatapad, Coimbatore-12.
8. Hydro Electric Power Station ('A') Unit: Mettur Dam Power House and 'B' Unit, Mettur Tunnel Power House. Post Box No. 4, Mettur Dam, (post) Salem District.

[No. F. 602(33)/70 HI.]

का० आ० 764.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 649, तारीख 29 जनवरी, 1971 के क्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 4 में विनिर्दिष्ट कारखानों की उक्त अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 3 में विनिर्दिष्ट तमिलनाडु राज्य के ऐसे क्षेत्रों में, जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त नहीं हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए, उक्त कारखाने को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5-क के अधीन उद्ग्रहणीय नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से उक्त अधिसूचना में विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि की समाप्ति की तारीख से एक वर्ष की और अवधि के लिए या तब तक के लिए जब तक कि उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उन क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त नहीं हो जाते, जो भी पहले हो, एतद्वारा छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

1. स्पेशल मेंटिनेन्स सब-डिविजन वर्कशाप कम्पाउंड, मेट्टूर डैम।
2. मीटर एण्ड रिलेटिविटीग सैक्सन, क्रास कट रोड, कोयम्बाटोर-12।
3. मीटर एण्ड रिलेटिविटीग एण्ड टेलीफोन सैक्सन, 8-81 ईस्ट मेन रोड, मेट्टूर डैम।
4. उदमालपेट सब-सेक्सन, तिरुपर रोड, उदमपेट, कोयम्बाटोर जिला।
5. स्पेशल मेंटिनेन्स लेबोरेटरी, कंट्रोल रूम, एम० आर० टी० सेक्सन, पासुमलाई, तमिल नाडु इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड, पासुमलाई, मदुराई-17।
6. पापनासम पावर हाउस, पापनासम प्रोजेक्ट पो० आ०, तिरुनेलवेली जिला।
7. स्पेशल मेंटिनेन्स रिपेयर शैड, क्रास कट रोड, टाटापद, कोयम्बाटोर-12।

8. हैड्रोइलेक्ट्रिक पावर स्टेशन ('ए') यूनिट : मेट्टूर डैम पावर हाउस तथा 'बी' यूनिट, मेट्टूर टनेल पावर हाउस। पोस्ट बॉक्स सं० 4, मेट्टूर डैम (पोस्ट) जिला सलेम।

[सं० फा० 602(33)/70-एच० आई०]

S.O. 765.—Whereas the Central Government was satisfied that (1) Messrs. Manava Fine Art Offset Works (2) Messrs. Cambata Ferro-Manganese Private Limited were situated in Tumsar area which was a sparse area (that is, an area whose insurable population was less than 500) in the district of Bhandara in the State of Maharashtra;

And, whereas by virtue of their location in a sparse area, the aforesaid factories were granted exemption from the payment of the employer's special contribution under section 73A of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) until enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in that area by the Central Government in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 2665, dated the 2nd November, 1961;

And, whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the insurable population of the Tumsar area in the district of Bhandara in the State of Maharashtra has now exceeded 500, and it is no longer a sparse area;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the said notification, namely:—

In Schedule IV to the said notification, against Serial No. 5 the entry "Tumsar" in column 4 and the corresponding entries in column 5 shall be omitted.

[No. F. 603/7/70-HI.]

का० आ० 765.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया था कि (1) मैसर्स मनाव फाइन आर्ट ऑफसेट वर्क्स (2) मैसर्स कम्बाटा फेरो-मैंगनीस प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, तुमसार क्षेत्र में स्थित था जो महाराष्ट्र राज्य के भांदरा जिले में बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र (अर्थात् ऐसा क्षेत्र जिसकी बीमा योग्य आबादी 500 से कम थी) था;

और, यतः उसकी बिखरी हुई आबादी के क्षेत्र में अवस्थिति के आधार पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उपर्युक्त कारखाने को, भारत सरकार के श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 2665 तारीख 2 नवम्बर, 1961 द्वारा कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) का धारा 73च के अधीन नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से तब तक के लिए छूट दे दी थी जब तक कि उस अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उस क्षेत्र में प्रवर्तित नहीं हो जाते;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि महाराष्ट्र राज्य के भांदरा जिले में तुमसार क्षेत्र की बीमा योग्य

आबादी अब 500 से बढ़ गई है, और वह अब बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र नहीं है;

अतः, अब, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73-च द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिसूचना में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची 4 में, स्तम्भ 4 में क्रम संख्या 5 के सामने “तुमसार” प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ 5 में की तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टियां लुप्त कर दी जायेंगी।

[सं० फा० 603(7)/70-एच० आई०]

S.O. 766.—Whereas the Central Government was satisfied that Messrs. Hindustan Construction Company was situated in Tumsar area which was a sparse area (that is an area whose insurable population was less than 500) in the district of Bhandara in the State of Maharashtra;

And, whereas by virtue of its location in a sparse area the aforesaid factory was granted exemption from the payment of the employer's special contribution under section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) until enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in that area by the Central Government in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 1073, dated the 3rd April, 1963;

And, whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the insurable population of the Tumsar area in the district of Bhandara in the State of Maharashtra has now exceeded 500, and it is no longer a sparse area;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the said notification, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification, against Serial No. 2, the entry “Tumsar” in column 3 and the corresponding entry in column 4 shall be omitted.

[No. F. 603(7)/70-HL.]

का० आ० 766.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया था कि मैसर्स हिन्दुस्तान कंस्ट्रक्शन कम्पनी, तुमसार क्षेत्र में स्थित था जो महाराष्ट्र राज्य के भांदरा जिले में बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र (अर्थात् ऐसा क्षेत्र जिसकी बीमा योग्य आबादी 500 से कम थी) था;

और, यतः उसकी बिखरी हुई आबादी के क्षेत्र में अवस्थिति के आधार पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उपर्युक्त कारखाने को, भारत सरकार के श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय के अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1073, तारीख 3 अप्रैल, 1963 द्वारा कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च के अधीन नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से तब तक के लिए छूट दे दी थी जब तक कि उस अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उस क्षेत्र में प्रवर्तित नहीं हो जाते;

और, यतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि महाराष्ट्र राज्य के भांदरा जिले में तुमसार क्षेत्र की बीमा योग्य आबादी अब 500 से बढ़ गई है, और अब वह बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र नहीं है;

अतः, अब कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिसूचना में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में, स्तम्भ 3 में, क्रम संख्या 2 के सामने “तुमसार” प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ 4 में की तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि लुप्त कर दी जायेंगी।

[सं० फा० 603(7)/70-एच० आई०]

S.O. 767.—Whereas the Central Government was satisfied that Messrs. Shriram Metal Industries was situated in Tumsar area which was a sparse area (that is, an area whose insurable population was less than 500) in the district of Bhandara in the State of Maharashtra;

And, whereas by virtue of its location in a sparse area the aforesaid factory was granted exemption from the payment of the employer's special contribution under section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) until enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in that area by the Central Government in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 2556, dated the 30th August, 1963;

And, whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the insurable population of the Tumsar area in the district of Bhandara in the State of Maharashtra has now exceeded 500, and it is no longer a sparse area;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the said notification, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification, against Serial No. 1, the entry “Tumsar” in column 3 and the corresponding entry in column 4 shall be omitted.

[No. F. 603(7)/70-HL.]

का० आ० 767.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया था कि मैसर्स श्रीराम मेटल इंडस्ट्रीज, जो तुमसार क्षेत्र में स्थित थी जो महाराष्ट्र राज्य के भांदरा जिले में बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र (अर्थात् ऐसा क्षेत्र जिसकी बीमा योग्य आबादी 500 से कम थी) था;

और, यतः, उसकी बिखरी हुई आबादी के क्षेत्र में अवस्थिति के आधार पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उपर्युक्त कारखाने को, भारत सरकार के श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 2556, तारीख 30 अगस्त, 1963 द्वारा कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च के अधीन नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से तब तक के लिए छूट दे दी थी जब तक कि उस अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उस क्षेत्र में प्रवर्तित नहीं हो जाते;

और, यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि महाराष्ट्र राज्य के भांदरा जिले में तुमसार क्षेत्र की बीमा योग्य आबादी अब 500 से बढ़ गई है, और अब वह बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र नहीं है;

अतः, अब कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिसूचना में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में स्तम्भ 3 में, क्रम संख्या 1 के सामने "तुमसार" प्रोवाइंट और स्तम्भ 4 में की तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि लुप्त कर दी जायेगी ।

[सं० फा० 603(7)/70-एचआई]

S.O. 768.—Whereas the State Government of Tamil Nadu has, in pursuance of clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), nominated Dr. P. R. Balakrishnan, Director of Health Services and Family Planning, Government of Tamil Nadu to a member of the Medical Benefit Council in place of Dr. P. S. Kumaravelu;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), No. S.O. 3680, dated the 21st August, 1971, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading "(Nominated by the State Governments concerned under Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10)", for the entry against item (11), the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"Dr. P. R. Balakrishnan,
Director of Health Services and Family Planning,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Madras."

[No. F. U-16012(13)/71-HI.]

का० प्रा० 768.—यतः तमिल नाडु राज्य सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अनुसरण में डा० पी० आर० बालाकृष्णन, निदेशक स्वास्थ्य सेवाएं तथा परिवार नियोजन तमिल नाडु सरकार को डा० पी० एस० कुमारवेलु के स्थान पर चिकित्सा प्रसुविधा परिषद् के सदस्य रूप में नाम-निर्दिष्ट किया है ।

अतः अब कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 3680 तारीख, 21 अगस्त 1971 में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में "(संबंधित सरकारों द्वारा धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट)" शीर्षक के नीचे मद (ii) के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जायेगी अर्थात् :—

"डा० पी० आर० बालाकृष्णन"

निदेशक स्वास्थ्य सेवाएं तथा परिवार नियोजन,
तमिल नाडु सरकार,
मद्रास ।"

[सं० फा० यू-16012(13) 71-एच० आई०]

S.O. 769.—Whereas the Central Government was satisfied that (1) Pallathra Bricks and Tiles Limited, Thirunallore, (2) Kannimuttam Oil Mills, (3) N. J. Jhon Oil Mills, (4) Veeyana Trades and Industries Manappuram were situated in Pallipuram Shertallay, Mattathukadvavu and Thakkattuseri Shertallay areas which were sparse areas (that is, areas whose insurable population was less than 500) in the district of Alleppey in the State of Kerala;

And, whereas by virtue of their location in the sparse area, the aforesaid factories were granted exemption from the payment of the employer's special contribution under section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) until enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in that area by the Central Government in the notification of the Government of India in the late Department of Social Security No. S.O. 3287, dated the 2nd September, 1964;

And, whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the insurable population of the Pallipuram Shertallay, Muttathukadvavu and Thakkattuseri Shertallay areas in the district of Alleppey in the State of Kerala has now exceeded 500, and it is no longer a sparse area;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the said notification, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification, against Serial No. 1, the entries "Pallipuram Shertallay", "Muttathukadvavu" and "Thakkattuseri Shertallay" in column 3 and the corresponding entries in column 4 shall be omitted.

[No. F. S-38018(6)71-HI.]

का० प्रा० 769.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया था कि

- (1) पालाथरा ब्रिक्स एण्ड टाइल्स लि०, थिरुनालोर
- (2) कर्नीमुट्टम आयल मिल्स
- (3) एन० जे० जान आयल मिल्स
- (4) वीयाना ट्रेड्स एण्ड इंडस्ट्रीज, मनापुरम

ए पालीपुरम शेरथलाई मुटाधुकाडवाव और थाडकाटुसरी के क्षेत्रों में स्थित थे । जो केरल राज्य के अलैपी जिले में बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र (अर्थात् ऐसा क्षेत्र जिसकी बीमा योग्य आबादी 500 से कम थी) था ;

और, यतः उसकी बिखरी हुई आबादी के क्षेत्र में अवस्थिति के आधार पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उपयुक्त कारखानों को भारत सरकार के सामाजिक सुरक्षा विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 3287, तारीख 2 सितम्बर, 1964 द्वारा कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च के अधीन नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से तब तक के लिए छूट दे दी थी जब तक कि उस अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उस क्षेत्र में प्रवर्तित नहीं हो जाते ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि केरल राज्य के अलैपी जिले में शेरथलाई क्षेत्र की बीमा योग्य आबादी अब 500 से बढ़ गई है और वह अब बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र नहीं है ;

अतः अब कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिसूचना में श्रीर आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में स्तम्भ 3 में क्रम सं० 1 के सामने “पालीपुरम शेरेथलाई” “मुटाथुकाडवाक्” और “वाइकाटुसरी शेरेथलाई” प्रविष्टियाँ और स्तम्भ 4 में की गई तत्स्थानों प्रविष्टियाँ लुप्त कर दी जायेंगी।

[सं० फा० एस-38018(6)/71-एच० आई०]

S.O. 770.—Whereas the Central Government was satisfied that the Shertallai Coir Mats and Matting Co-operative Society Limited, Shearing Factory; was situated in Shertallay area which was a sparse area (that is, an area whose insurable population was less than 500) in the district of Alleppey in the State of Kerala;

And, whereas by virtue of its location in a sparse area the aforesaid factory was granted exemption from the payment of the employer's special contribution under section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) until enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in that area by the Central Government in the notification of the Government of India in the Department of Social Security No. S.O. 948, dated the 19th March, 1965;

And, whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the insurable population of the Shertallay area in the district of Alleppey in the State of Kerala has now exceeded 500, and it is no longer a sparse area;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the said notification, namely:—

In the Schedule to the notification, against Serial No. 1, the entry “Shertallay” in column 3 and the corresponding entry in column 4 shall be Omitted.

[No. F. S-38018(6)/71/HL.]

का० प्रा० 770.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया था कि दि शेरेथलाई कीयर मैट्स एण्ड मैटिंग को-ओपरेटिव सोसाइटी लिमिटेड शीयरिंग फॅक्टरी; शेरेथलाई क्षेत्र में स्थित था जो केरल राज्य के अलैपी जिले में बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र (अर्थात् ऐसा क्षेत्र जिसकी बीमा योग्य आबादी 500 से कम थी) था;

और यतः उसकी बिखरी हुई आबादी के क्षेत्र में अवस्थिति के आधार पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उपर्युक्त कारखाने को भारत सरकार के सामाजिक सुरक्षा विभाग की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 948, तारीख 19 मार्च 1965 द्वारा कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च के अधीन नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से तब तक के लिए छूट दे दी थी जब तक कि उस अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उस क्षेत्र में प्रवर्तित नहीं हो जाते।

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि केरल राज्य के अलैपी जिले में शेरेथलाई क्षेत्र की बीमा योग्य आबादी

अब 500 से बढ़ गई है और वह अब बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र नहीं है;

अतः अब कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिसूचना में श्रीर आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में स्तम्भ 3 में क्रम सं० 1 के सामने “शेरतलाई” प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ 4 में की तत्स्थानों प्रविष्टि लुप्त कर दी जायेगी।

[सं० फा० एस-38018(6)/71-एच० आई०]

S.O. 771.—Whereas the Central Government was satisfied that (1) Shankar Paint and Oil Mills (P) Limited, 4 Cullen Road (2) Variamparanbil Oil Mills, Manappuram; were situated in Shertallai area which was a sparse area (that is, an area whose insurable population was less than 500) in the district of Alleppey in the State of Kerala;

And, whereas by virtue of their location in a sparse area the aforesaid factories were granted exemption from the payment of the employer's special contribution under section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) until enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in that area by the Central Government in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 1995, dated the 1st June, 1968;

And, whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the insurable population of the Shertallai area in the district of Alleppey in the State of Kerala has now exceeded 500, and it is no longer a sparse area;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the said notification, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification, against Serial No. 1, the entry “Shertallai” in column (3) and the corresponding entries in column (4) shall be omitted.

[No. F. S-38018(6)/71/HL.]

का० प्रा० 771.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया था कि (1) शंकर पेंट एण्ड आयल मिल्स (प्रा०) लि०, 4, कलन रोड, (2) वरियमपरबिल आयल मिल्स, मनापुरम; शेरेथलाई क्षेत्र में स्थित थे जो केरल राज्य के अलैपी जिले में बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र (अर्थात् ऐसा क्षेत्र जिसकी बीमा योग्य आबादी 500 से कम थी) था;

और यतः उसकी बिखरी हुई आबादी के क्षेत्र में अवस्थिति के आधार पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उपर्युक्त कारखाने को, भारत सरकार के श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 1995, तारीख 1 जून, 1968 द्वारा कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च के अधीन नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से तब तक के लिए छूट दे दी थी जब तक कि उस अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उस क्षेत्र में प्रवर्तित नहीं हो जाते;

और, यतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि केरल राज्य अलैपी जिले में शेरथलाई क्षेत्र की बीमा योग्य आबादी अब 500 से बढ़ गई है, और वह अब बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र नहीं है ;

अतः, अब कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73ब द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिसूचना में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में स्तम्भ (3) में क्रम सं० 1 के सामने "शेरथलाई" प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ (4) की में तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टि लुप्त कर दी जायेगी।

[सं० फा० एस-38018(6)/71-एच० आई०]

S.O. 772.—Whereas the Central Government was satisfied that Kerala Food Packers was situated in Sherthallai area which was a sparse area (that is, an area whose insurable population was less than 500) in the district of Alleppey in the State of Kerala;

And, whereas by virtue of its location in a sparse area, the aforesaid factory was granted exemption from the payment of employer's special contribution under section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) until enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in that area by the Central Government in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 3684, dated the 9th October, 1968;

And, whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the insurable population of the Sherthallai area in the district of Alleppey in the State of Kerala has now exceeded 500, and it is no longer a sparse area;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the said notification, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification, Serial No. 1, and the entries relating thereto shall be omitted.

[No. F. S-38028(6)/71/HI.]

का० प्रा० 772.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया था कि केरल फूड पैकर्स, शेरथलाई क्षेत्र में स्थित था जो केरल राज्य के अलैपी जिले में बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र (अर्थात् ऐसा क्षेत्र जिसकी बीमा योग्य आबादी 500 से कम थी) था ;

और, यतः उसकी बिखरी हुई आबादी के क्षेत्र में अवस्थिति के आधार पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उपर्युक्त कारखाने को, भारत सरकार के श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार

विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० प्रा० 3684 तारीख 9 अक्टूबर, 1968 द्वारा कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73ब के अधीन नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से तब तक के लिए छूट दे दी थी जब तक कि उस अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उस क्षेत्र में प्रवर्तित नहीं हो जाते ;

और, यतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि केरल राज्य के अलैपी जिले में शेरथलाई क्षेत्र की बीमा योग्य आबादी अब 500 से बढ़ गई है, और वह अब बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र नहीं है ;

अतः, अब कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73ब द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिसूचना में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची में क्रम संख्या 1 और तत्सम्बन्धी प्रविष्टियां लुप्त कर दी जायेंगी।

[सं० फा० एस-38018(6)/71-एच० आई०]

New Delhi, the 4th February 1972

S.O. 773.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government having regard to the location of the Biological Products Section, Badshah Bagh, Lucknow in an area in which the provisions of Chapters IV and V of the said Act are in force, hereby exempts the said factory from the payment of the employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a period of one year with effect from the 15th May, 1971 upto and inclusive of the 14th May, 1972.

[No. 6(60)69-HI.]

नई दिल्ली, 4 फरवरी, 1972

का० प्रा० 773.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73ब द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार बायोलॉजिकल प्रोडक्ट्स सेक्शन, बादशाह बाग, लखनऊ की ऐसी क्षेत्र में, जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबन्ध प्रवर्तित हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए उक्त कारखाने को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5-क के अधीन उद्ग्रहणीय नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से 15 मई, 1971 से 14 मई, 1972 तक जिसमें वह दिन भी सम्मिलित है, एक वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए एतद्वारा छूट देती है।

[सं० फा० 6(60)69-एच० आई०]

S.O. 774.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73 F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (24 of 1948) the Central Government, having regard to the location of the factories specified in column (4) of the Schedule here to annexed in areas specified in column (3) of the said Schedule in the State of Maharashtra in which the provisions of Chapters IV and V of the said Act are not in force, hereby exempts the said factories from the payment of employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a period of one year from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette or until the enforcement of provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in those areas, whichever is earlier.

SCHEDULE

Serial No.	Name of District	Name of Area	Name of the factory
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	Wardha	Wardha	1. Rahstra bhasha Press. 2. Prabhat Oil Mills. 3. Rajasthan Oil Mills. 4. Prabhat Oil and Extraction Industries. 5. Prakash Vegetable Oil Products. 6. Prakash Udyog Solvent Extraction Plant. 7. Prakash Binola Udyog.

[No. F. 601/29/70-HI]

अनुसूची

का० आ० 774.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73ब द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 4 में विनिर्दिष्ट कारखानों की उक्त अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 3 में विनिर्दिष्ट महाराष्ट्र राज्य के ऐसे क्षेत्रों में, जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त नहीं हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए, उक्त कारखाने का उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5-क के अधीन उद्ग्रहण योग्य नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से उक्त अधि-सूचना के राजपत्र में राजपत्र की तारीख से 9 वर्ष की अवधि के लिए या तब तक के लिए जब तक कि उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उन क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त नहीं हो जाते, जो भी पहले हो, एतद्वारा छूट देती है।

क्रम	जिले का नाम	क्षेत्र का नाम	कारखाने का नाम
महारा			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1.	वर्धा	वर्धा	1. राष्ट्रभाषा प्रैस
			2. प्रभात आयल मिल्स
			3. राजस्थान आयल मिल्स
			4. प्रभात आयल एण्ड एक्स-ट्रैशन इंडस्ट्रीस
			5. प्रकाश वैजिटेबल आयल प्रोडक्ट्स
			6. प्रकाश उद्योग सोलवेट एक्सट्रैशन प्लांट
			7. प्रकाश बिनोला उद्योग

[सं० का० 601(29)/70-एच० आई०]

S.O. 775.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) the Central Government, having regard to the location of the factories specified in column (4) of the Schedule hereto annexed in areas specified in column (3) of the said Schedule in the State of Maharashtra in which the provisions of Chapters IV and V of the said Act are not in force hereby exempts the said factories from the payment of employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the Act said for a period of one year from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette or until the enforcement of provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in those areas, whichever is earlier.

SCHEDULE

Serial No.	Name of District	Name of Area	Name of the Factory
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	Ahmednagar	Savedi	Messrs. S. M. Saffi and Brothers.
		Kapurwadi	Messrs. Building Material Supply Company, Shendi.
2	Akola	Washim	Messrs. Gulati Dall Mills.
3	Amravati	Paratwada	Messrs. M.S.R.T. Corporation.
4	Bhandara	Bhandara	(1) Messrs. Parasram Kundanlal. (2) Messrs. Kothari Metal Industries.
5	Poona	Fursingi	Messrs. Dhare Concrete products.
6	Thana	Palghar	Messrs. Muralo Chemicals and Paint Private Limited

[No. F. 601 (29)/70-HI]

का० आ० 775.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73 च द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची के स्तंभ 4 में विनिर्दिष्ट कारखानों की उक्त अनुसूची के स्तंभ 3 में विनिर्दिष्ट महाराष्ट्र राज्य के ऐसे क्षेत्रों में, जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त नहीं हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए उक्त कारखाने को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के अधीन उद्ग्रहणीय नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से उक्त अधिसूचना के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिये या तब तक के लिये जब तक कि उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उन क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त नहीं हो जाते, जो भी पहले हों, एतद्वारा छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	जिले का नाम	क्षेत्र का नाम	कारखाने का नाम
1	2	3	4
1	अहमदनगर	सावदी कपूरवादी	मैसर्स एस० एम० सफी एंड ब्रादर्स। मैसर्स बिल्डिंग मैटेरियल सप्लाय कम्पनी, शैडो।
2	अकोला	वाशिम	मैसर्स गुलाटी दाल मिल्स।
3	अमरावती	पारतवाडा	मैसर्स एम० एम० आर० टी० कार्पोरेशन।
4	भादरा	भादरा	(1) मैसर्स पारसराम कुन्दनलाल। (2) मैसर्स कोठारी मेटल इंडस्ट्रीस।
5	पूना	फरसिंगी	मैसर्स घेरे कंक्रिट प्रोडक्ट्स
6	थाना	पलवर	मैसर्स मुराली कैमिकल्स एंड पेंट प्राइवेट लिमिटेड।

[फा० सं० 601 (29)/70-एच० आई०]

S.O. 776.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) S.O. 1310 dated the 6th March, 1971 the Central Government having regard to the location of the Cochin Refineries Limited, Cochin in an area in which the provisions of Chapter IV and V of the said Act are not in force, hereby exempts the said refineries from the payment of the employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from the 6th December, 1971 upto and inclusive of the 5th December, 1972.

[No. F. 601(69)/70-HI.]

का० आ० 776.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73 च द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1310 तारीख 6 मार्च 1971 के क्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार कोचीन रिफाइनरीज लिमिटेड कोचीन की ऐसी क्षेत्र में, जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त नहीं हैं अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए उक्त कारखाने को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5-क के अधीन उद्ग्रहणीय नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से 6 दिसम्बर 1971 से 5 दिसम्बर 1972 तक जिसमें वह दिन भी सम्मिलित है एक और वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए एतद्वारा छूट देती है।

[स० फा० 601/(69)/70-एच० आई०]

S.O. 777.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 1843 dated the 19th April, 1971 the Central Government having regard to the location of the factory, namely Machine Shop-cum-Tool Room, Calcutta-2, and the Chrome Tanning Extension Centre, Calcutta-46 in an area in which the provisions of Chapters IV and V of the said Act are in force, hereby exempts the said factories from the payment of the employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from the 1st January, 1972 upto and inclusive of the 31st December, 1972.

[No. F. 601(77)/70-HI.]

का० आ० 777.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73 च द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1843 तारीख 19 अप्रैल 1971 के क्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार कारखाना अर्थात् मशीन शाप-कम-टूलर रूम इन्ड कलकत्ता-2 तथा क्रोम टैनिंग एक्सटेंशन सेंटर कलकत्ता-46 की ऐसी क्षेत्र में जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए उक्त कारखानों को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5-क के अधीन उद्ग्रहणीय नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से 1 जनवरी 1972 से 31 दिसम्बर

तक जिसमें वह दिन भी सम्मिलित है, एक और वर्ष की कालाविधि के लिए एतद्वारा छूट देती है।

[सं. फा० 601(77)/70-एच० आ० ई०]

S.O. 778.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 3278 dated the 14th September, 1970, the Central Government having regard to the location of the factory, known as Hindustan Aeronautics Limited, Nasik Division, Nasik, in an area in which the provisions of Chapters IV and V of the said Act are in force, hereby exempts the said factory from the payment of the employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from the date of expiry of the period specified in the said notification.

[No. F. 602(20)/70-HI.]

S.O. 779.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 75F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), and continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 3607, dated the 23rd October, 1970 the Central Government having regard to the location of the factories specified in column (4) of the Schedule here to annexed in areas specified in column (3) of the said Schedule in the State of Kerala in which the provisions of Chapters IV and V of the said Act are not in force, hereby exempts the said factories from the payment of employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a further period of one year from the date of expiry of the period specified in the said notification or until the enforcement of provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in those areas, whichever is earlier.

SCHEDULE

Serial No.	Name of District	Name of Area	Name of the factory
1	2	3	4
1	Cannanore	Kanhirode	Messrs. Kanhirode Weavers' Co-operative production and sales Society Ltd., No. 1144, Koodali.
2	Ernakulam	Kanayannur	Messrs. O.E.N. India Limited, Mullanthuruthy.
3	Kottayam	Konnanthady Changanacherry	Messrs. Panniar Power Station, Vellathuval. Messrs. Vijaya Match and Timber Industries.
4	Quilon	Paravoor Thekkumbagam Thekkumbagam	Messrs. Flarco, Paravoor. Messrs. Kerala Seafoods, Neendakara.
5	Trichur	Vedakkumuri	Messrs. Reslonons and Chemical Products.

[No. F. 602(25)/70-HI.]

फा० आ० 779.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73F द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 3607 तारीख 23 अक्टूबर, 1970 के क्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार इससे उगावद्ध अनुसूची के स्तंभ 4 में विनिर्दिष्ट कारखानों को उक्त अनुसूचित के स्तम्भ 3 में विनिर्दिष्ट केरल राज्य के ऐसे क्षेत्रों में, जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबंध प्रवृत्त नहीं हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए उक्त कारखाने को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 क के अधीन उद्घाटनीय नियोजक के विशेष अधिदाय के संदाय से उक्त अधि सूचना में विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि की समाप्ति की तारीख से एक वर्ष की और अवधि के लिये या तब के लिये जब तक कि उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबंध उन क्षेत्रों में प्रवृत्त नहीं हो जाते जो भी पहले हों, एतद्द्वारा छूट देती है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	जिले का नाम	क्षेत्र का नाम	कारखाने का नाम
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1	कनानोर	कनहीरोड	मैसर्स कनहीरोड वीक्स को ग्राप रेटिव प्रोडक्शन तथा सेल्स सोसाइटी लिमिटेड, सं० 1144, कुडाली।

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2.	अरन.कुलम	कनायानूर	मैसर्स ओ० ई० एन० इंडिया लिमिटेड, मुलानथुली ।
3.	कोटायम	कोनानथडी चंगनाचेरी	मैसर्स पनियार पावर स्टेशन, वेलायूवल । मैसर्स विजया मैच एंड टिम्बर इंडस्ट्रीज ।
4.	क्विनोन	पारावूर ठेक्कूगम	मैसर्स फ्लैकों, पारावूर मैसर्स केरल सी फुड्स, नोंदाकारा ।
5.	त्रिवूर	वेदाकुमरी	मैसर्स रिसिग्रोन्स एंड कैमिकल्स प्रोडक्ट्स ।

[सं. फा. 602(25)/70-एच.आई.]

S.O. 780.—Whereas the Government of Haryana has, in pursuance of clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), nominated Dr. Hakumat Roy, Assistant Director, Health Services (Social Insurance), Government of Haryana to be a member of the Medical Benefit Council in place of Dr. P. N. Dugal;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), No. S.O. 3680, dated the 21st August, 1971, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading "(Nominated by the State Governments concerned under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10)", for the entry against item (8), the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"Dr. Hakumat Roy, Assistant Director, Health Services (Social Insurance), Government of Haryana, Chandigarh."

[No. F. U. 16012/8/71-HI.]

का. प्रा. 780.—अतः हरयाणा राज्य सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अनुसरण में डा० हकुमत राय सहायक निदेशक-स्वास्थ्य सेवाएं (समाजिक बीमा) हरयाणा सरकार को डा० पी. एन. दुगल के स्थान पर चिकित्सा प्रमुखता परिषद के सदस्य के रूप में नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है ;

अतः अब कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० प्रा० 3680 तारीख 21 अगस्त, 1971 में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्—

उक्त अधिसूचना में (सम्बन्धित सरकारों द्वारा धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ख) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट) शीर्षक के नीचे मद (8) के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जायेगी अर्थात्:—

"डा० हकुमत राय,

सहायक निदेशक स्वास्थ्य सेवाएं (समाजिक बीमा),

हरयाणा सरकार,

चण्डीगढ़।"

[सं. फा. यू. 16012/8/71-एच.आई.]

S.O. 781.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby exempts the Fertilizer Corporation of India Limited, Trombay Unit, Bombay-74 from all the provisions of the said Act for a period of one year with effect from the date of publication of the Notification in the official Gazette.

[No. F. S-38014(19)/71-HI.]

का० प्रा० 781.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73ब द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार फर्टिलाइजर कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया ट्रॉम्बे युनिट बम्बई 74 की ऐसी क्षेत्र में जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए उक्त कारखाने को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5-क के अधीन उद्ग्रहणीय नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से राजपत्र में अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए एतद्वारा छूट देती है।

[सं. फा. एस-38014(19)/71-एच.आई.]

S.O. 782.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government having regard to the location of the Government Vaccine Institute, Namkum, Ranchi in an area in which the provisions of Chapters IV and V of the said Act are in force, hereby exempts the said Institute from the payment of the employer's special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act for a period of one year with effect from the 29th October, 1971, upto and inclusive of 28th October, 1972.

[No. F. S-38014(23)/71-HI.]

का० प्रा० 782.—कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73ब द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार गर्वनमेंट वेक्सिन इंस्टीट्यूट, नामकुम, रांची के ऐसे क्षेत्र में जिसमें उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 4 और 5 के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त हैं, अवस्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए उक्त संस्था को उक्त अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 क के अधीन उद्ग्रहणीय नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से 29 अक्टूबर, 1971 से 28 अक्टूबर, 1972 तक जिसमें यह दिन भी सम्मिलित है, एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए एतद्वारा छूट देती है।

[सं. फा. 38014(23)/71 एच.आई.]

S.O. 783.—Whereas the Central Government was satisfied that—

(1) Neyyarapilly Oil Mills.

(2) St. Mary's Oil Mills.

- (3) St. Laurant Oil Mills.
- (4) Charangath Coir Manufacturing Company.
- (5) Devankal Match Factory.
- (6) Swamy Brothers Oil Mills.
- (7) Mc. Dowell and Company Limited.

were situated in Sherthalai area which was a sparse area (that is, an area whose insurable population was less than 500) in the district of Alleppey in the State of Kerala;

And, whereas by virtue of their location in a sparse area, the aforesaid factories were granted exemption from the payment of the employer's special contribution under section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) until enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of the said Act in that area by the Central Government in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 670 dated the 27th February, 1962;

And, whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the insurable population of the Sherthalai area in the district of Alleppey in the State of Kerala has now exceeded 500, and it is no longer a sparse area;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the said notification, namely:—

In the Schedule II to the said notification, against Serial No. 1, the entry "Sherthalai" in column 3 and the corresponding entries in column 4 shall be omitted.

[No. F. S-38018(6)/71-HI.]

का० आ० 783.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह समाधान हो गया था कि :

1. नेयरापिली आयल मिल्स
2. सेन्ट मैरी आयल मिल्स
3. सेन्ट लारेंस आयल मिल्स
4. चरणगढ़ कोयर मैन्यूफैक्चरिंग कम्पनी
5. दक्कल मंच फैक्टरी
6. स्वामी ब्रादर्स आयल मिल्स
7. मैक डवेल एण्ड कम्पनी लिमिटेड ।

शेरथलाई क्षेत्र में स्थित ये जो केरल राज्य के अलपेयी जिले में बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र (अर्थात् ऐसा क्षेत्र जिसकी बीमा योग्य आबादी 500 से कम थी) था ;

और, यतः, उसकी बिखरी हुई आबादी के क्षेत्र में अवस्थित के आधार पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उपर्युक्त कारखानों को, भारत सरकार के श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 670 तारीख 27 फरवरी, 1962 द्वारा कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73च के अधीन नियोजक के विशेष अभिदाय के संदाय से तब तक के लिये छूट दे दी थी जब तक कि उस अधिनियम के अध्याय 5 के उपबन्ध उस क्षेत्र में प्रवर्तित नहीं हो जाते ;

और, यतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार का यह समाधान हो गया है कि केरल राज्य के अलपेयी जिले में शेरथलाई क्षेत्र की बीमा योग्य आबादी अब 500 से बढ़ गई है, और वह अब बिखरी हुई आबादी का क्षेत्र नहीं है ;

अतः, अब कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 73-च द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिसूचना में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना की अनुसूची II में, स्तम्भ 3 में, क्रम संख्या 1 के सामने "शेरथलाई" प्रविष्टि और स्तम्भ 4 में की तत्स्थानी प्रविष्टियों को लुप्त कर दी जायेगी ।

[सं० फा० एस-38018 (6)/71-एच०आई०]

S.O. 784.—Whereas the State Government of Andhra Pradesh has, in pursuance of clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), nominated Dr. P. Seshagiri Rao, Deputy Director of Medical and Health Services (Employees State Insurance), Government of Andhra Pradesh to be a member of the Medical Benefit Council in place of Dr. K. Ramesh Pai;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 3680, dated the 21st August, 1971, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading "(Nominated by the State Governments concerned under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10)", for the entry against item (4), the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"Dr. P. Seshagiri Rao, Deputy Director of Medical and Health Services, (Employees State Insurance), Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad."

[No. F. U-16012/8/71-HI.]

का० आ० 784.—यतः आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य सरकार हैं कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अनुसरण में डा० पी० शेशागिरि राव, उप-निदेशक, चिकित्सीय तथा स्वास्थ्य सेवायें (कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा) आन्ध्र प्रदेश सरकार को डा० के० रमेश पी के स्थान पर चिकित्सा प्रसुविधा परिषद् के सदस्य के रूप में नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है ;

अतः, अब, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 3680 तारीख 21 अगस्त, 1972 में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में "(सम्बन्धित सरकारों द्वारा धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट शीर्षक के नीचे मद (4) के सामने की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जायेगी, अर्थात् :—

"डा० पी० शेशागिरि राव,
उप-निदेशक, चिकित्सीय तथा स्वास्थ्य सेवायें,
(कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा),
आन्ध्र प्रदेश सरकार, हैदराबाद ।"

[सं० फा० यू-16012/8/71-एच० आई०]

S.O. 785.—Whereas the State Government of Mysore has, in pursuance of clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), nominated Dr. P. R. Desai, Director of Health and Medical Services (Employees' State Insurance Scheme), Government of Mysore to be a member of the Medical Benefit Council in place of Dr. H. G. Sattur;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), No. S.O. 3680, dated the 21st August, 1971, namely:—

In the said notification, under the heading "[Nominated by the State Governments concerned under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10]", for the entry against item (13), the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"Dr. P. R. Desai, Director Health and Medical Services, (Employees' State Insurance Scheme), Government of Mysore, Bangalore".

[No. F. U-16012/11/71-HI.]

का० आ० 785.—यतः मैसूर राज्य सरकार ने कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अनुसरण में डा० पी० आर० देसाई, निदेशक, स्वास्थ्य एवं चिकित्सा सेवायें (कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा स्कीम) मैसूर सरकार को डा० एच० जी० माथुर के स्थान पर चिकित्सा प्रमुखता परिषद् के सदस्य के रूप में नामनिर्दिष्ट किया है ;

अतः, अब, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 3680 तारीख 21 अगस्त, 1971 में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में "(सम्बन्धित सरकारों द्वारा धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) के अधीन नामनिर्दिष्ट)" शीर्षक के नीचे मद 13 के सामन की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि प्रतिस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

डा० पी० आर० देसाई,
निदेशक, स्वास्थ्य तथा चिकित्सा सेवायें,
(कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा स्कीम),
मैसूर सरकार, बंगलौर ।

[सं० फा० यू-16012/11/71-एच० आई०]

CORRIGENDA

New Delhi, the 3rd February 1972

S.O. 786.—In the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 3607 dated the 23rd October, 1970, published at pages 5062-63 of the Gazette of India, Part II, section 3, sub-section (ii) dated the 7th November, 1970, at page 5062 in line 6 from the bottom, for "are in force" read "are not in force".

[No. F. 602/25/70-HI.]

शुद्धिपत्र

नई दिल्ली, 3 फरवरी, 1972

का० आ० 786.— भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 3607 तारीख 23 अक्टूबर, 1970 में, जो भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खण्ड 3(ii) तारीख 7 नवम्बर, 1970 के पृष्ठ सं० 5062-63 पर प्रकाशित हुई थी, के पृष्ठ 5062 पर नीचे से छठी पंक्ति में "प्रवृत्त है" के स्थान पर "प्रवृत्त नहीं है" पढ़ें ।

[सं० फा० 602(25)/70-एच० आई०]

S.O. 787.—In the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 649, dated the 29th January, 1971, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated the 6th February, 1971, at page 729, for "are in force" read "are not in force".

[No. F. 602(33)/70-HI.]

का० आ० 787.— भारत सरकार के भूतपूर्व श्रम, रोजगार और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 649 तारीख 29 जनवरी, 1971 में, जो भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खण्ड 3(ii) तारीख 6 फरवरी, 1971 के पृष्ठ 729 पर प्रकाशित हुई थी, "प्रवृत्त है" के स्थान पर "प्रवृत्त नहीं है" पढ़ें ।

[सं० फा० 602(33)/70-एच० आई०]

New Delhi, the 4th February 1972

S.O. 788.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 5063, dated the 30th October, 1971, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3 (ii) dated the 6th November, 1971, on page 5972, in line 5 for "Yerrabalaem" read "Yerrabalaem".

[No. F. 13/16/69-HI.]

नई दिल्ली, 4 फरवरी, 1972

का० आ० 788.—भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वासि मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या 5063 तारीख 30 अक्टूबर 1971 में जो भारत सरकार के राजपत्र भाग 2, खण्ड 3 (ii) तारीख 6 नवम्बर, 1971 में प्रकाशित हुई है के पृष्ठ 5972 पर छठी पंक्ति में "येराबलाएम" के स्थान पर "येराबलएम" पढ़ें ।

[सं० फा० 13/16/69-एच० आई०]

दलजीत सिंह, अवर सचिव ।

New Delhi, the 9th February 1972

S.O. 789.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 3680, dated the 21st August, 1971, published at pages 5227-5228 of Part I, section 3, sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 9th October, 1971, at page 5227 in line 25 from the bottom for "Dr. H. N. Pital" read "Dr. H. N. Patel".

[No. F. U-16012/8/71-HI.]

DALJIT SINGH, Under Secy.

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 31st January 1972

S.O. 790.—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Cochin Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1959, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 21st March, 1972.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

Draft Scheme

1. This Scheme may be called the Cochin Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1972.

2. In clause 32 of the Cochin Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1959, in the first proviso, for the words "rupee one and fifty naye paise," the words "rupees two" shall be substituted.

[No. 54/11/70-P&D.]

(अभ्य और रोजगार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 31 जनवरी, 1972

क्रा० आ० 790.—कोचीन डॉक कर्मकार (नियोजक का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1959 में और आगे संशोधन करने के लिए एक स्कीम का निम्नलिखित प्रात्य, जिसे केन्द्रीय सरकार डॉक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए बनाने की प्रस्थापन करती है, उक्त उपधारा की अपेक्षानुसार उन सभी व्यक्तियों की सूचना के लिए प्रकाशित किया जाता है जिनका उसके द्वारा प्रभावित होना संभाव्य है; और एतद्वारा सूचना दी जाती है कि उक्त प्रात्य पर 21 मार्च, 1972 को या उसके पश्चात् विचार किया जाएगा।

उक्त प्रात्य के बारे में किसी भी व्यक्ति से, इस प्रकार विनिर्दिष्ट तारीख से पूर्व प्राप्त होने वाले आक्षेपों या सुझावों पर केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा विचार किया जाएगा।

प्रात्य स्कीम

1. यह स्कीम कोचीन डॉक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) संशोधन स्कीम, 1970 कही जा सकेगी।

2. कोचीन डॉक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1959 के खंड 32 में, प्रथम परन्तुक में, शब्द "एक रूपया पचास नए पैसे" के लिए शब्द "दो रूपये" प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे।

[सं० 54/11/70-पी० एण्ड डी०]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 31st January 1972

S.O. 791.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the

employers in relation to the management of Messrs Chowgule and Company, Private Limited, Mormugao Harbour and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

1. Whether the management of Messrs Chowgule and Company Private Limited, Mormugao Harbour is justified in including the food subsidy for computation of total emoluments of their workmen employed in the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant, Mormugao Harbour for the purpose of fitment of their pay while implementing the final recommendation of the Central Wage Board for Port & Dock Workers at major ports with effect from the 1st January, 1969? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?
2. Whether Messrs Chowgule and Company Private Limited, Mormugao Harbour were justified in withdrawing the MOHD allowance and food subsidy of their workmen employed in the Mechanical Ore Handling Plant, Mormugao Harbour while implementing the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers at Major Ports. If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?

[No. L-36011/8/71-P&D.]

O. P. TALWAR, Dy. Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 31 जनवरी, 1972

क्रा० आ० 791.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपायबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स चौगुले एण्ड कम्पनी, प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, मारमूगाव बन्दरगाह के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मुम्बई को न्याय निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

1. क्या मैसर्स चौगुले एण्ड कम्पनी, प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, मारमूगाव बन्दरगाह के प्रबन्धमंडल की अपने तकनीकल और हैंडलिंग प्लांट, मारमूगाव बन्दरगाह में नियोजित कर्मकारों की उन परिलब्धियों की संगणना में महापत्तनों पर पत्तन और डाक कर्मकारों के लिए केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की अन्तिम सिफारिश को-

1 जनवरी 1969 से लागू करते समय, खाद्य साहायिकी को सम्मिलित करना न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

2. क्या मैसर्स चोगले एण्ड कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, मारमूगाओ बन्दरगाह द्वारा महापत्तनों पर पत्तन और डाक कर्मकारों के लिए केन्द्रीय मजदूरी बोर्ड की सिफारिशों को लागू करते समय अपने मैकेनिकल और हैंडलिंग प्लांट मारमूगाओ बन्दरगाह में नियोजित कर्मकारों के एम० ओ० एच० डी० भत्ते और खाद्य साहायिकी को प्रत्याहृत करना न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

[सं० एल०-36011/8/71-पी० एण्ड डी०]

ओ० पी० तलवाड़, उप सचिव ।

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 1st February 1972

S.O. 792.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 83 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby exempts all the mines working yellow clay from the provisions of the said Act except those contained in sections 7, 8, 9, 44, 45 and 46 on the condition that the aforesaid mines shall fulfil the conditions specified in the proviso to clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the said Act.

[No. S. 29014/4/71-M]

(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 1 फरवरी, 1972

का० आ० 792.—खान अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35) की धारा 83 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा पीली मिट्टी पर काम कर रही सभी खानों को उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्धों से सिवाय धारा 7, 8, 9, 44, 45 और 46 में अन्तर्गट के इस शर्त पर कि पूर्वोक्त खान उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 3 के परन्तुक में विनिर्दिष्ट शर्तों को पूरा करेंगी, छूट देती है ।

[सं० एस. 29014(4)/71-एम०आई०]

New Delhi, the 9th February 1972

S.O. 793.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri B. M. Ghorai as Inspector of Mines subordinate to the Chief Inspector of Mines.

[No. 8/45/69-MI.]

नई दिल्ली, 9 फरवरी, 1972

का० आ० 793.—खान अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री बी० एम० घोरे को मुख्य खान निरीक्षक के अधीन खान निरीक्षक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है ।

[संख्या 8/45/69-एम० आई०]

New Delhi, the 10th February 1972

S.O. 794.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour & Employment No. S.O. 531, dated the 2nd March, 1961, namely:—

In the said notification, the following entry shall be omitted, namely:—

“(84) Shri B. N. Singh.”

[No. A. 35021/2/72-M.I.]

J. D. TEWARI, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 10 फरवरी, 1972

का० आ० 794.—खान अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 531 तारीख 2 मार्च, 1961 में और आगे निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्,

उक्त अधिसूचना में निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि का लोप कर दिया जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“(84) श्री बी० एन० सिंह”

[संख्या ए० 35021/2/72-एम० आई०]

जे० डी० तिवारी, अवग सचिव ।

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 9th February 1972

S.O. 795.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 9 of the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1947 (32 of 1947), the Central Government has appointed with effect from the 1st February, 1972 (forenoon), Shri R. P. Sinha as the Coal Mines Welfare Commissioner, vice Shri S. N. Pande.

[No. A-19011/2/72-M-II.]

(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 9 फरवरी, 1972

एस० ओ० 795.—कोयला खान मजदूर कल्याण निधि अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 32) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) के अनुसार केन्द्रीय सरकार ने श्री आर० पी० सिन्हा को 1 फरवरी 1972 की पूर्वाह्न से श्री एस० एन० पांडे के स्थान पर, कोयला खान कल्याण आयुक्त, नियुक्त किया है ।

[सं० ए० 19011/2/72-एम०-2.]

S.O. 796.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5 of the Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1948 (22 of 1948), read with sub-clause (1A) of clause (a) of sub-rule (1) of rule 3 of the Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund Rules, 1948, the Central Government has appointed with effect from the 1st February, 1972 (forenoon), Shri R. P. Sinha, Coal Mines Welfare Commissioner, Dhanbad, as the Welfare Commissioner,

Mica Mines Labour Welfare Fund, Bihar vice Shri S. N. Pande.

[No. A-19011/2/72.M-II.]

C. R. NAIR, Under Secy.

एस० नं० 796.—अन्नक खान मजदूर कल्याण निधि अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 22) की धारा 5 और अन्नक खान मजदूर कल्याण निधि नियम, 1948 के नियम 3 के उपनियम (1) की धारा (क) की उप धारा (iA) के अनुसार भारत सरकार ने श्री आर० पी० सिन्हा, कोयला खान कल्याण आयुक्त, धनबाद, को 1 फरवरी, 1972 की पूर्वाह्न से श्री एस० एन० पांडे के स्थान पर, कल्याण आयुक्त, अन्नक खान मजदूर कल्याण, बिहार, नियुक्त किया है।

[सं० ए० 19011/2/72-एम०-2]

सी० आर० नायर, अवर सचिव।

(Department of Labour and Employment)

New Delhi, the 14th February 1972

S.O. 797.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Labour Court, Calcutta, in the matter of applications under section 33A of the said Act, from Shri Panchanan Banerjee and Balohari Manji and 23 other workmen of Messrs Shankarlall Deokinandan and Company, Post Office Bhamuria, District Purulia, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th February, 1972.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT LABOUR COURT AT CALCUTTA

Misc. Applications No. LC 1 and LC 2 of 1971

(Under Section 33A of I.D. Act).

PARTIES:

IN APPLICATION NO. LC 1 OF 1971

Workmen of Hirakhun Colliery of Messrs Shankarlall Deokinandan & Co., P. O. Bhamuria, Dt. Purulia.—Applicants.

Vs.

1. Manager, Hirakhun Colliery, P.O. Bhamuria, Dist. Purulia.
2. M/s. Shankarlall Deokinandan & Co., P.O. Bhamuria, Dt. Purulia.—Opp. Parties.

IN APPLICATION NO. LC 2 OF 1971

Workmen of Hirakhun Colliery of Messrs Shankarlall Deokinandan & Co., P.O. Bhamuria, Dt. Purulia.—Applicants.

Vs.

1. M/s. Shankar Lall Deokinandan & Co., P.O. Bhamuria, Dt. Purulia.
2. Manager, Hirakhun Colliery, P.O. Neturia, Dist. Purulia.—Opp. Parties.

PRESENT:

Shri S. N. Bagchi—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of Applicants.—Shri S. K. Gupta, President, Hirakhun Colliery Mazdoor Sabha.

On behalf of Opp. Parties.—Shri Shyam Sundar Kejriwal, Personnel Officer.

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mines.

AWARD

These are two applications No. LC 1 of 1971 and LC 2 of 1971 under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, presented by the applicant Sri Panchanan Banerjee and Balohari Manji and 23 others respectively, and are to be decided as agreed upon by the parties by this one and the same award.

2. The allegations of Panchanan Banerjee, Lamp chageman against the Opposite party colliery concerned, are that he is a lamp chageman of Hirakhun colliery and his services had been illegally terminated by an order of dismissal by the Manager, Hirakhun Colliery under letter No. Nil dated 5th February, 1971, while a dispute had been pending before this Court for nonpayment of Panchanan Banerjee's dearness allowance. Panchanan made an application under Sec. 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act before this Court along with some other applicant workmen of the colliery concerned. He is in that application petitioner No. 33. The application of Panchanan and his co-workmen, according to Panchanan, has been registered as LC 3 under Section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Panchanan complains that the colliery Opposite party intentionally violated the provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by terminating his services by an order of dismissal as mentioned above. So, he prays that his complaint should be decided and suitable orders accordingly should be passed. He has authorised Sri Jamini Kanta Gupta, President of Hirakhun Colliery Mazdoor Sabha to represent him and to conduct and plead for him in the case before this Court, if and when necessary.

3. In the other case being Misc. Application No. LC 2 of 1971, filed by Balohari Manji and 23 others workmen represented by Sri Jamini Kanta Gupta, President of Hirakhun Colliery Mazdoor Sabha, the allegations are that on 18th May, 1971 the Manager of Hirakhun colliery served notice on 25 workmen of the colliery for retrenchment with effect from 19th June, 1971 while disputes being LC 3 of 1971, LC 4 of 1971, LC 5 of 1971, LC 6 of 1971 and LC 7 of 1971 and Misc. Appli. No. LC 1 of 1971 have been pending before this Court. So the applicants prayed for an order of stay of operation of the retrenchment notice by the Manager of Hirakhun colliery or else the poor workmen are to suffer irreparable loss and damage. These two applications Misc. Appl. LC 1 & 2 purport to be one under Sec. 33A.

4. In both the cases the management of the colliery appeared through its Personnel Officer. Mr. Kejriwal.

5. There is no dispute that the LC cases Under Sec. 33 of the Act referred to in the two applications are pending before this Court or at least some of them were pending when these Misc. Applications under Sec. 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act had been presented, registered and brought to docket of this Court complaining the alleged violation of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, maintainable under Sec. 33A of the Act for adjudication as it were under Sec. 33A of the Act. Mr. Kejriwal pointed out and that very correctly that the applications under Sec. 33C(2) being the applications of the LC cases mentioned above in both the Misc. LC cases did not come within the definition of "Industrial dispute" and that the applicants in the Misc. applications concerned have no right to come with the complaints under Sec. 33A of the Act before this Court.

6. Mr. Gupta for the applicants submitted that because the applications under Sec. 33C(2) are pending before this Court being an Industrial Court, he thought that Sec. 33 or as a matter of that Sec. 33A of the Act are both attracted when Panchanan was dismissed and the notices of retrenchment were served on Balohari and 23 other applicants in the Misc. Application No. LC 2 of 1971. I am sorry, Mr. Gupta's contention cannot be legally accepted. Section 33 sub-section (1) reads as follows:

- (1) During the pendency of any conciliation proceeding before a conciliation officer or a Board or of any proceeding before a Labour Court or Tribunal or National Tribunal in respect of an industrial dispute, no employer shall—

x x x x x x

- (2) During the pendency of any such proceedings in respect of an industrial dispute, the employer may, in accordance with the standing orders applicable to a workman concerned in such dispute (or, where there are no such standing orders, in accordance with the terms of the contract, whether express or implied, between him and the workman),—

- (a) alter, in regard to any matter not connected with the dispute, the conditions of service applicable to that workman immediately before the commencement of such proceeding; or
- (b) for any misconduct not connected with the dispute, discharge or punish, whether by dismissal or otherwise, that workman;

"Provided that no such workman shall be discharged or dismissed, unless he has been paid wages for one month and an application has been made by the employer to the authority before which the proceeding is pending for approval of the action taken by the employer."

The most important expression upon which the entire Section 33 of the Act is pivoted is "in respect of an industrial dispute". "Industrial dispute" has been defined in Sec. 2(k) of the Act. The claim of an individual workman under Sec. 33C of the Industrial Disputes Act relates to monetary and or non-monetary benefits firstly where the money is due to a workman concerned from an employer under a settlement or an award or under the provisions of Chapter VA, and secondly, when any workman is entitled to receive from the employer any money or any benefit which is capable of being computed in terms of money; and if any question arises as to the amount of money due or as to the amount at which such benefit should be computed, the question may subject to any rule that may be made under the Act, be decided by the Labour Court as may be specified in this behalf by the appropriate Government. Even in a case where any money is claimed due to a workman from an employer under a settlement or an award or under the provisions of Chapter VA and he claims an amount on the right created by either of those provisions, he can make an application to the appropriate Government for a certificate in regard to the money he claims. But, if the Government is such a case cannot ascertain correctly, the money due, such claim may be referred to a Labour Court computation of monetary or non-monetary benefits claimable and due for computation and determination by a Labour Court under Section 33C(2). Therefore, the scope of Sec. 33C has no link for being tagged with the scope of an industrial dispute as defined by Sec. 2(k) of the Act. The principle behind Sec. 33C is that there must be a right existing to a workman, either under an award or a settlement or under Chapter VA of the Industrial Disputes Act or even under a scheme made under an Act or recommendations of any Wage Board accepted by the employer and the employees, a decree of a Court or some such document which in between the employer and the employee or rather employer and the workmen creates an existing right to claim a benefit which is either computable to money which computation may be of money claimable, and due but not easily computable or any benefit claimable and convertible into money and computable as money due. In either of such cases, the existing right to claim the benefit is thus created under a variety of creative documents as mentioned above which make out a right to the claim in favour of the workman, being either money certain and due, money uncertain but computable and ascertainable as due, or benefits convertible to money ascertainable and determinable as such on proper computation. But

"industrial dispute" pre-supposes an existing dispute on a difference between the opposing groups as mentioned under Section 2(k) of the Act and such dispute does not by itself create any right. The award adjudging such an industrial dispute may create a right to claim benefits as that which comes within the scope of Sec. 33C(1) & (2) of the Industrial Disputes Act. Therefore, the *sine qua non* for an application under Sec. 33A is the pendency of a proceeding in regard to an industrial dispute before the Conciliation Officer or Board or a Tribunal or a Court or a National Tribunal. An application under Section 33C(1) and 33C(2) of the Act, cannot, by any stretch of imagination be relatable to an "industrial dispute". Now, when the applications either under Section 33C(1) or 33C(2), are pending before this Court, there is no industrial dispute pending either referred to it by the appropriate Government or entertained deeming as a dispute by this Court as an industrial dispute within the scope of Sec. 33A of the Act. Therefore, the applications under Sec. 33C(2) as mentioned in both the Misc. applications do not come within the expression "in respect of any industrial dispute" as occurring in Sub-section (1) of Sec. 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. Sec. 33A of the Act reads as follows:

"Where an employer contravenes the provisions of section 33 during the pendency of proceeding before a Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal, any employee aggrieved by such contravention, may make a complaint in writing, in the prescribed manner to such Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal and on receipt of such complaint that Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall adjudicate upon the complaint as if it were a dispute referred to or pending before it, in accordance with the provisions of this Act and shall submit its award to the appropriate Government and the provisions of this Act shall apply accordingly."

I have observed that 33A contemplates a deeming industrial dispute upon the complaint made by a workman for an alleged contravention by the employer of Sec. 3. So, Sec. 33 and 33A must be read together to find out whether complaint in these two cases can be entertained within the scope of Sec. 33A read with Sec. 33 of the Act. I have observed that Sec. 33 is pivoted on the expression "in respect of any industrial dispute". Having regard to the context of the structure of Sec. 33 and 33A of the Act, the complaint by a workman for alleged violation of Sec. 33 of the Act by the employer is untenable since any application under Sec. 33C(1) and 33C(2) of the Act does not give rise to an "industrial dispute" and as such the proceedings on such applications before this Court cannot come within the expression "in respect of any industrial dispute" as occurring in Sub-section (1) of Section 33 of the Act. Therefore, these two Misc. applications cannot be entertained before and by this Court since proceedings in the LC cases referred to in the Misc. applications are not "in respect of an industrial dispute" pending before this Court within the scope of Section 33 of the Act.

7. Accordingly, I accept the contention of Sri Kejriwal and cannot persuade myself to accept the contention of Sri Gupta. For the reasons recorded above these two applications being not entertainable by this Court, are rejected. There will be no order as to costs.

This is my award on both the applications.

S. N. BAGCHI,
Presiding Officer.

New Delhi, the 31st January, 1972.

[IN 6. 1925/72-LRI.]

New Delhi, the 16th February 1972

S.O. 798.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the managements of (1) New Chirimiri Ponri Hill Colliery, Post Office Chirimiri and (2) West Chirimiri Colliery, Post Office Chirimiri and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 11th February, 1972.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR.

Dated, December 4, 1971.

PRESENT:

Shri M. Chandra—*Presiding Officer*

CASE REF. No. CGIT/LC(R)(10)/1969.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the managements of (1) New Chirimiri Ponri Hill Colliery Post Office Chirimiri and (2) West Chirimiri Colliery, Post Office, Chirimiri and their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

For employers—1. Sri P. S. Nair Advocate for West Chirimiri Colliery P. O. Chirimiri.

2. Sri G. Srinivasan for New Chirimiri Ponri Hill Colliery, P. O. Chirimiri.

For workmen—Sri Gulab Gupta Advocate, General Secretary, Madhya Pradesh Colliery Workers' Federation.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mine. **DISTRICT:** Surguja (M.P.)

AWARD

PART I

This is an application by the management of West Chirimiri Colliery and their workmen represented by M. P. Colliery Workers' Federation (M.P.C.W.F.) for an award in terms of the compromise arrived at between them.

The Central Government, by an order No. 1/2/69-LRII dated 12th March, 1969, referred to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, the following industrial dispute as given in the schedule attached to the order of reference:—

Dispute

"Whether the managements of (1) New Chirimiri Ponri Hill Colliery, Post Office Chirimiri and (2) West Chirimiri Colliery, Post Office Chirimiri, having regard to their financial capacity are justified in not paying variable dearness allowance as per the recommendations of the Wage Board for the Coal Industry with effect from the 1st April, 1968? If so, what should be the quantum of variable dearness allowance in the above mentioned collieries?"

The M. P. Colliery Workers Federation filed their written statement on 21st March, 1969. Thereafter the two employers i.e. (1) New Chirimiri Ponri Hill Colliery, and (2) West Chirimiri Colliery requested on 16th April, 1969 for time to file their written statements. A writ petition had been meanwhile filed in the Hon'ble High Court at Delhi and stay had been requested by the New Chirimiri Ponri Hill Colliery. The West Chirimiri Colliery filed a writ petition in the M. P. High Court. Both the managements obtained stay orders. The proceedings were consequently stayed. Sri G. Srinivasan, on behalf of the New Chirimiri Ponri Hill Colliery, informs this

Tribunal that their petition in the Hon'ble High Court at Delhi has now been withdrawn. The order of the M. P. High Court dated 24th September, 1971 shows that the stay order dated 25th April, 1969 has been vacated and the petition has also been dismissed. The case can therefore now proceed. But instead of filing any written statement the management of West Chirimiri Colliery have entered into a settlement with the workmen and have filed this joint application as already mentioned by the management of West Chirimiri Colliery and the workers.

The case for the workmen was that the Central Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry submitted its recommendations to the Government which adopted them by Resolution dated 21st July, 1967 and recommended that the same should come in force with effect from 15th August, 1967. The managements who are parties to this reference refused to implement these recommendations of the Wage Board. A strike notice was then served on the employers including the two employers under reference by the Unions of the Coal Mining Industry including the M. P. Colliery Workers Federation. The intention was to call a token strike on 3rd October, 1967. At a meeting at Nagpur on 30th September, 1967 between the representatives of the Union including the M.P. Colliery Workers Federation and the Coal Committee of Madhya Pradesh and Vidharbha Mining Association, of which the two managements who are parties to this reference are members, it was decided that the Wage Board recommendations as accepted by the Government of India, would be implemented by the employers and the payment of wages at new rates would be made with effect from 15th October, 1967. It was further agreed that if any employer was in financial difficulty he would discuss the date of payment with its Union at local level. All the employers of Korce Coalfield including the two employers, who are parties to this reference, implemented the Coal Wage Board recommendations under the aforesaid agreement. On 30th September, 1967 when the agreement was signed at Nagpur the Variable Dearness Allowance was to be paid at 0.72 P. per day. The employers started paying @ Rs. 1.11 P. per day with effect from 1st October, 1967. This indicated that the scheme of Variable Dearness Allowances of the Coal Wage Board recommendations was accepted by the employers without any reservation and that increased rate was made applicable without any demand by the Unions. The strike notice was consequently withdrawn by the Unions. Because of the rise in Index Number the Variable Dearness Allowance payable from 1st April, 1968 became payable at Rs. 1.47 P. per day. The employers in private sector collieries including the two employers who are parties to the dispute refused to give Variable Dearness Allowance and continued to pay the Variable Dearness Allowance at the old rate i.e. Rs. 1.11 P. per day. This resulted in great discontentment and unrest. Another strike notice was served on the employers demanding full implementation of the Wage Board recommendations in respect of Variable Dearness Allowance. The conciliation proceedings failed and the failure report was sent to the Government on 4th December, 1968. The strike notice also was not given effect to. No further talks took place and the statement continued. Another notice was then served on the employers on 13th December 1968 demanding the implementation of the Wage Board recommendations in full. The conciliation proceedings again failed but instead of the failure report mutual discussions between the parties continued. When the parties failed to reach a settlement the strike commenced in the two collieries under reference from 6th February 1969 and 7th February 1969. The strike was called off by an agreement on 27th February 1969 at New Delhi and the parties left the matter of Variable Dearness Allowance to be referred to this Tribunal by the Government. This reference has accordingly been made in pursuance of that agreement. The workman maintained that the scheme of Variable Dearness

Allowance as contained in the Coal Wage recommendations should be given legal sanction by passing an award in terms of the agreement and that they were entitled to Variable Dearness Allowance Rs. 1.47 P. per day with effect from 1st April, 1968 to 31st March, 1969 and thereafter at the rate in accordance with the scheme of Variable Dearness Allowance as recommended by the Coal Wage Board. This was the claim in the written statement, which had been filed on 21st March, 1969.

The proceedings were stayed thereafter and since then cost of living index has fluctuated and now the M. P. Colliery Workers Federation on behalf of the workmen and the West Chirimiri Colliery have entered into a settlement and jointly prayed for an award in terms thereof.

By this settlement, it is agreed that the management would pay Variable Dearness Allowance at the rate of Rs. 1.60 P. per day with effect from 1st August, 1971, that for the period 1st August, 1968 to 30th September, 1969 an additional Variable Dearness Allowance of 0.16 paise per day per worker (i.e. in addition to what has already been paid for that period) would be paid to the workers who are on the rolls of the Company on the date of the award and had been in continuous service. This increased rate of Variable Dearness Allowance as contemplated by the agreement is clearly beneficial to the workmen and is not beyond the financial capacity of the West Chirimiri Colliery. It is in the interest of both the workmen and the management that industrial peace in that colliery is secured by reason of this increase in the Variable Dearness Allowance agreed to by the West Chirimiri Colliery and the workmen.

It has been further agreed in this agreement that the arrears of Variable Dearness Allowance from 1st August, 1968 to 30th September, 1969 would be paid in one instalment within three months from the date of the award and that the quantum of V. D. A. of Rs. 1.60 P. would continue to be paid irrespective of the Cost of Living Index upto 31st March, 1973 and also thereafter till a fresh settlement on the issue is arrived at between the parties by negotiations or otherwise for the period after 1st April, 1973. These provisions are also in the interest of both the parties and are just and fair. The parties to the settlement have also agreed to bear their own expenses of the reference and application pending before the Hon'ble High Court. A sum of Rs. 10 per cent of the arrears payable under this award would, however, be realised by the Union as their expenses in this dispute. The settlement has been filed and verified by Sri P. S. Nair Advocate for the management of West Chirimiri Colliery and Sri Gulab Gupta Advocate for the workmen. The New Chirimiri Ponri Hill Colliery filed objections to this settlement. After the statement of Sri Gulab Gupta today that this agreement should not be taken into consideration in adjudicating upon the dispute between the workmen and the management of New Chirimiri Ponri Hill Colliery and on agreement of Sri P. S. Nair to this statement Sri G. Srinivasan, on behalf of the New Chirimiri Ponri Hill Colliery, withdrew his objections.

On a consideration of the entire settlement, I find that it is just and fair and beneficial to both the parties of the compromise. An award, Part I, is accordingly made in terms of the settlement which shall form Part of the award. This settlement as agreed to between the parties would not be taken into consideration in the adjudication of the dispute between the workmen and the management of New Chirimiri Ponri Hill Colliery. Let the award Part I be sent to the Central Government.

(Sd.) M. CHANDRA,
Presiding Officer.

Dated 14-12-1971.

Memorandum of Settlement

Place: Jabalpur, M. P.

Date: 16th September, 1971

PARTIES:

Representing Management.—Gurmukh Singh,
Agent, West Chirimiri Colliery.

Representing Workmen.—1. Shri Gulab Gupta,
General Secretary, Madhya Pradesh Colliery
Workers Federation.

2. Sri Raj Bali Singh, President, West Chirimiri
Colliery Branch of M. P. Colliery Workers
Federation.

Short Recital of the Case

By an order dated the 12th March, 1969 the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment had referred the dispute between the parties regarding non-payment of V. D. A. as per recommendations of the Wage Board for Coal Mining Industry w.e.f. 1st April, 1968 to the Hon'ble Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur. The management made an application before the Hon'ble High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Jabalpur, challenging the reference on certain grounds which is still pending before the Hon'ble High Court.

In the meantime the parties discussed this matter mutually and arrived at the following settlement on the subject matter of the reference and have decided to request the Hon'ble Tribunal for a compromise Award in terms of the settlement herein below:—

Terms of settlement

1. It is agreed that the management would pay V.D.A. at the rate of Rs. 1.60 w.e.f. 1st April, 1971.

2. Further agreed that for the period from 1st August 1968 to 30th September, 1969 addition V.D.A. of 18 paise per day per worker (i.e. in addition to what has already been paid for that period) would be paid to the workers who are on the rolls of the Company on the date of the Award and have been in continuous service.

3. Agreed that the arrears of V.D.A. under item 2 above would be paid in one instalment within 3 months from the date of the Award.

4. Agreed that the quantum of V.D.A. of Rs. 1.60 would continue to be paid irrespective of the cost of living index upto 31st March, 1973 and also thereafter till fresh settlement on the issue which may be arrived at between the parties by negotiations or otherwise for the period after 1st April, 1973.

5. Further agreed that the parties would jointly request the Hon'ble Tribunal for passing compromise Award in terms of this settlement.

6. Agreed that the parties would bear their own expenses of the reference and application pending before the Hon'ble High Court. However, a sum of 10 per cent of the arrear payments under this Award would be realised by the Union as their expenses for this dispute.

7. Further agreed that this is in full and final settlement as regards the dispute matter covered by the reference.

Representing Management.

(Sd.) GURMUKH SINGH, ...
16th September, 1971.

Representing Workmen:

(Sd.) GULAB GUPTA,
(Sd.) RAJ BALI SINGH.

Witnesses

1. (Sd.) ILLEGIBLE.
2. (Sd.) G. C. JAIN.

Filed and verified by Shri P. S. Nair Advocate for the management of West Chirimiri Colliery and Sri Gulab Gupta Advocate for the workmen.

(Sd.) M. CHANDRA,
Presiding Officer.
16-9-71.

Part of the Award

(Sd.) M. CHANDRA,
Presiding Officer.

[No. 1/2/69-LRIL.]

New Delhi, the 19th February 1972

S.O. 799.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 3), Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhowra Colliery of Messrs Bhowra Kankanee Collieries Limited, Post Office Bhowra, District Dhanbad, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th February, 1972.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
(NO. 3) AT DHANBAD**

REFERENCE No. 25 OF 1970

PRESENT:

B. S. Tripathi, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to Bhowra Colliery, Post Office—Bhowra, District—Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen, represented by the Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Bhowra Colliery Branch, Post Office Bhowra, District—Dhanbad.

APPEARANCES:

For Employers—Sri B. M. Lall.

For Workmen—Sri Md. Hafiz Ansari, Asstt. Secretary of the Union.

INDUSTRY: Coal

STATE: Bihar.

Dhanbad, dated the 11th February 1972

AWARD

1. This is a reference under Section 10(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act XIV of 1947) made by the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment & Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) by their Order No. 8/61/69-LRIL, dated the 29th April, 1970 to this Tribunal on the joint application of the employers in relation to the management of Bhowra Colliery of Messrs Bhowra Kankanee Collieries Limited, Post Office Bhowra, District Dhanbad and their workmen, represented by the Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Bhowra Colliery Branch, Post Office Bhowra, District Dhanbad and after being satisfied that the persons applying represent the majority of each party, for adjudication of the matters set forth in the application of the parties and reproduced in the Schedule of reference. The Schedule is extracted below:—

SCHEDULE

“Whether the claim of the Trammers of Bhowra Colliery to enhance the rate of Trammeling consequent upon the increase in the size of Tubs from 36 C.Ft. to 40½ C.Ft. are justified? If so, what should be quantum of enhanced rate?”

2. Neither party has filed written statement in the present case.

3. On 25th January, 1972 a joint petition of compromise was filed alleging that settlement had been arrived at between the parties and praying to pass an award in the terms embodied in the compromise. Certain defects were noticed by the Tribunal in the compromise petition and parties were directed to remove the same or to explain on 9th February, 1972. It was noticed that the Oriental Coal Company Limited, though not a party in the proceeding, was a party to the compromise. On the petition of the parties filed on 9th February, 1972 the Oriental Coal Company Limited was impleaded in the reference in the category of employers as per order passed on that date (vide Order No. 14 dated 9th February, 1972). It appears that under the orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Calcutta dated 23rd June, 1970 in Company Petition No. 123 of 1970 connected with Company Application No. 412 of 1969 M/s. Bhowra Kankanee Collieries Ltd., to whom the Bhowra Colliery in question originally belonged, merged in M/s. Oriental Coal Company Ltd., with effect from 1st June, 1970. As per the said order all the liabilities and duties of M/s. Bhowra Kankanee Collieries Ltd. become the liabilities and duties of M/s. Oriental Coal Co. Ltd. and all the proceedings pending by or against M/s. Bhowra Kankanee Collieries Ltd. will be continued by or against M/s. Oriental Coal Co. Ltd. Thus M/s. Oriental Coal Co. Ltd. are necessary parties in the present proceeding and are competent to enter into the compromise in question.

4. After hearing the representatives of the parties and after giving due consideration to the terms of reference for adjudication and the terms of settlement embodied in the compromise petition, I find that the terms of compromise are reasonable and fair to all the parties. Accordingly, I accept the compromise and pass an award in terms thereof. The compromise petition containing the terms of settlement will form part of the award and is attached herewith as Annexure 'A'.

5. Let the Award be submitted to the Central Government under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

(Sd.) B. S. TRIPATHI,
Presiding Officer.

12-2-72.

ANNEXURE 'A'

**BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
NO. 3 AT DHANBAD**

REFERENCE No. 25 OF 1970

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to Bhowra Colliery

AND

Their workmen.

Joint petition of compromise

The parties abovenamed most respectfully beg to submit as under:—

1. That, the aforesaid matter is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal for adjudication.

2. That, the parties in the meantime have mutually negotiated the matter and have arrived at a settlement in terms hereunder:—

(a) that of the total 114 workmen involved in the case, the breakup figures on the basis of place of work are as follows:—

(i) No. 4 Pit and No. 5 Pit—Surface 45 workmen.

(ii) No. 4 Pit—Underground—21 workmen.

(iii) 5 Pit Underground—21 workmen.

(iv) 4 Incline—Surface—15 workmen.

(v) No. 4 Incline—underground—12 workmen.

Total 114 workmen.

(b) It is agreed that the workmen of the different place of work as described in (a) above the rate of the tramming per tub head are enhanced as per Table below:—

- (i) No. 4 Pit and No. 5 Pit Surface:—the rate is increased to Rs. 1.09 from 0.96 P.
- (ii) No. 4 Pit underground rate is increased from 0.81 P. to Rs. 1.11 P.
- (iii) No. 5 Pit underground the rate is increased from 0.94 ½ paise to Rs. 1.01 P.
- (iv) No. 4 Incline Surface the rate is increased from 0.69 paise to 1.00.
- (v) No. 4 Incline Underground from 0.61 to 0.90 P.

3. That aforesaid enhanced rate will be applicable with effect from the 30th August, 1971.

4. That, the arrears of the difference in the rate from 30th August, 1971 till 8th January, 1972 will be paid to the concerned 114 workmen within one month from the date of this settlement.

5. That the parties will bear their respective cost of this proceedings.

6. That, in the circumstances the parties herein concerned beg to pray that this Hon'ble Tribunal may graciously be pleased to accept this settlement and pass an Award in terms hereof.

And for this act of kindness the parties as in duty bound shall ever pray.

Dated Bhowra, the 14th January, 1972.

For the Employers	For the Workmen
1. (Sd.) R. P. MEHRA, Manager (N).	1. (Sd.) NAVAL KISHORE LALL, Secretary,
2. (Sd.) N. K. SHARMA, Manager (S)	C.M.S. Branch.
	2. (Sd.) MD. HAFIZ ANSARI, Asstt. Secy, Bhawra (Branch)
	3. (Sd.) K. N. SINGH, Member C. M. S. Dhanbad.
3. (Sd.) BRIJMOHAN LALL, 15-1-72. Personal Officer and for the Custodian of Bhawra Group.	4. (Sd.) ILLEGIBLE, Adviser. 25-1-72.
	2. MD. HAFIZ HUSAIN, for Oriental Coal Co. Ltd.,
4. (Sd.) ILLEGIBLE, Constituted Attorney.	

[No. 8/61/69-LRII.]

(Department of Labour and Employment)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 11th November 1971

S.O. 800.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Junkundar Colliery of Messrs D. Mondal and Company, Post Office Chirkunda, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Junkundar Colliery of Messrs D. Mondal and Company, Post Office Chirkunda, District Dhanbad, in refusing re-employment to the workmen mentioned below after the re-start of the colliery

from April/June, 1970, was justified? If not, to what relief these workmen are entitled?

1. Shri Badal Mallick,
2. Shri Charu Mallick,
3. Shri Dhuja Mallick,
4. Shri Rampado Mallick,
5. Shri Dasrath Mallick,
6. Shri Binod Mallick,
7. Shri Panu Mallick,
8. Shrimati Basni Majhian,
9. Shri Babul Bourl,
10. Shri Sukal Bourl,
11. Shri Tata Bourl,
12. Shrimati Sonamani Majhian,
13. Shrimati Ramini Majhian,
14. Shri Sisu Bourl,
15. Shri Bhikha Bourl,
16. Shri Mahesh Bourl,
17. Shri Habu Napit,
18. Shri Rakhonari Bourl,
19. Shri Rabi Bourl,
20. Shri Rampati Nonia,
21. Shri Nourang Rajwar,
22. Shri Biswanath Rajwar,
23. Shri Etwari Bhuian,
24. Shri Sarup Bhuian,
25. Shri Sibnath Kahar,
26. Shri Ramasis Sao,
27. Shri Mahabir Bhuian,
28. Shri Rampati Bhuian,
29. Shri Rameswar Ram,
30. Shri Ganesh Rajwar,
31. Shri Jageswar Bhuian,
32. Shri Bhagirath Rai,
33. Shri Jagannath Rai,
34. Shri Tara Bourl,
35. Shri Babul Bourl,
36. Shri Kalut Ram,
37. Shri Ramadin Mandal,
38. Shri Jauardan Jha,
39. Shri Mathurachandra Mandal,
40. Shri Raghu Ram,
41. Shri Gobardhan Bhuian,
42. Shri Kishun Bhuian,
43. Shri Roudi Bhuian,
44. Shri Jageswar Ram,
45. Shri Gobind Ram,
46. Shri Tikam Bhuian,
47. Shri Narain Dusadh,
48. Shri Sanchar Bhuian,
49. Shri Dasrath Bhuian,
50. Shri Faguni Bhuian,
51. Shri Butu Bhuian, and
52. Shri Prabhu Bhuian."

[No. L./2012/124/71-LR II.]

(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 11 नवम्बर, 1971

का० आ० 800.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपावद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स डी० मोण्डल एण्ड कम्पनी की जुनकुण्डार कोलियरी, शकषर चिरकुंडा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबंध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, श्रम, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा

उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (संख्या 1), धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

“क्या मैसर्स डी० मोण्डल एण्ड कम्पनी की जुनकुण्डार कोलियरी, डाकघर बिरकुण्डा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धमण्डल की कोलियरी के अप्रैल/जून, 1970 से पुनः चालू हो जाने के बाद निम्नलिखित कर्मकारों को पुनः नियोजन देने से हटकार करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी ? यदि नहीं, तो ये कर्मकार किस अनुतोप के हकदार हैं ?

1. श्री बादल मल्लिक
2. श्री चारु मल्लिक
3. श्री धुजा मल्लिक
4. श्री रामपादो मल्लिक
5. श्री दसरथ मल्लिक
6. श्री विनोद मल्लिक
7. श्री पानु मल्लिक
8. श्रीमती बासनी माझियां
9. श्री बाबुलाल बोडरी
10. श्री मुकुल बोडरी
11. श्री टाटा बोडरी
12. श्रीमती सोनामानी माझियां
13. श्रीमती कामिनी माझियां
14. श्री सिमु बोडरी
15. श्री भिखा बोडरी
16. श्री महेश बोडरी
17. श्री हाबु नापित
18. श्री राजोहारी बोडरी
19. श्री रावी बोडरी
20. श्री रामपती नोनिया
21. श्री नौरंग राजवर
22. श्री विस्वानाथ राजवर
23. श्री एटवारी भुइयां
24. श्री सरूप भुइयां
25. श्री सिबन्तथ कहार
26. श्री रामसिस साओ
27. श्री महाबीर भुइयां
28. श्री रामपती भुइयां
29. श्री रामेश्वर राम
30. श्री गणेश राजवर
31. श्री जागेस्वर भुइयां
32. श्री भागीरथ राय
33. श्री जागरनाथ राय
34. श्री तारा बोडरी
35. श्री बाबुल बोडरी

36. श्री कालुट राम
37. श्री रामादीन मण्डल
38. श्री जोआरदन शा
39. श्री माथुराचन्द्रा मण्डल
40. श्री रघु राम
41. श्री गोबरधन भुइयां
42. श्री किशुन भुइयां
43. श्री रोजदी भुइयां
44. श्री जागेस्वर राम
45. श्री गोविन्द राय
46. श्री टिकम भुइयां
47. श्री नारायण दुसाध
48. श्री सनीचर भुइयां
49. श्री दसरथ भुइयां
50. श्री फागुनी भुइयां
51. श्री बुतु भुइयां और
52. श्री प्रभु भुइयां “

[सं० एल/2012/124/71-एन०आर०-II]

New Delhi, the 18th November, 1971

S.O. 801.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Newton Chickli Colliery, Post Office Parasia, District Chhindwara and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Messrs Newton Chickli Colliery, Post Office Parasia, District Chhindwara, (Madhya Pradesh) in dismissing from service Sarvashri Abdul Gaffar, Loader and Peer Mohanmad, General Mazdoor, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?”

[No. L/2212/10/71-LRII.]

नई दिल्ली, 18 नवम्बर, 1972

का० अ० 801.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उद्भव अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में न्यूटन चिकली कोलियरी, डाकघर परासिया, जिला छिन्दवाड़ा से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा

उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर को न्याय निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुपूर्वः

“क्या मैसर्स न्यूटन चिकनी कोलियरी, डाकघर परासिया, जिला छिन्दवाड़ा (मध्य प्रदेश) के प्रबन्ध मण्डल की सर्वश्री अब्दुल/गफ्फार, लंहर और पीर मोहम्मद, साधारण मजदूर को पदच्युत करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो ये कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?”

[सं० एल०/2212/10/71-एल० आर०-2]

New Delhi, the 3rd December 1971

S.O. 802.—Whereas, the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Post Office Kothagudium Collieries (Andhra Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri P. S. Ananth, as Presiding Officer with headquarters at Afzal Lodge, Tilak Road, Ramkote, Hyderabad-I, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

1. “Is the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudium (Ramagundum Division I and II) justified in employing Sarvasbri Raja Moineuddin, Merugu Gattaiah, Bahdur Khan, Sardar Khan, D. Srihari, Md. Gaffar, Kunta Parvaiahlu, Elgam Rajam, Soula Laxamaiah, M. Iswari Das, Y. Hanumanth Rao, Sardar Khan, Matla Kistiah, Kedari Malliah, R. Bhadrach, E. Venkati, K. Mallalah, Sk. Yacob Ali and A. Bargaiah, Category III Pump Khalasis on more than one pump during the week from the 23rd May, 1971 to the 29th May, 1971 and in refusing to pay them category IV wages for the said period? If not justified, to what relief are the said workmen entitled for the said period and also for the periods when they were employed on more than one pump?”
2. “Is the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudium (Ramagundum I and II Divisions) justified in employing Sarvasbri D. Radhakrishna, Kannam Rajanarsu, Kondalaxman, Dasi Posham, Janga Ch. Posham, Thalukonda Rajesham, Nimmala Ramaswamy, K. Venkati, Oddy Rayamallu and Kamuni Odalu, Category-II Pump Khalasis on more than 35 H.P. Pumps during the week from the 23rd May, 1971 to the 29th May, 1971 and in refusing to pay them category-III wages for the said period? If not justified, to what relief are the said workmen entitled for the said period and also for the periods when they were employed on more than one pump?”
3. “Is the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Kothagudium (Ramagundum I and II Divisions) justified in employing Sarvasbri Purandla Ramulu, A. Verraswamy, D.

Rajamouli, Raja Mohammad, J. Samuel, S. Suryanarayana, Ghousuddin, Maddela Durgalah, L. Venkati, G. Ramallu, Erabathula Muthaiah, Kendukuri Agaiah and Elupula Ramulu, Category-II Pump Khalasis on more than one pump and also on more than 35 H.P. Pumps during the week ending 23rd May, 1971 to the 29th May, 1971 and in refusing to pay them category IV wages? If not justified, to what relief are the said workmen entitled for the said period and also for the periods when they were employed on more than one pump?”

[No. L/2112/32/71-J.R.II.]

नई दिल्ली, 3 दिसम्बर, 1971

का० आ० 802. —यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड डाकघर कोठागुडियम कोलियरीज (आन्ध्र प्रदेश) के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्याय निर्णयनके लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री पी० एम० आनन्ध होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय अफजल लॉज, तिलक रोड, रामकोटे, हैदराबाद होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

- “1. क्या सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड कोठागुडियम (रामागुंडम डिवीजन-1 और 2) के प्रबन्ध मण्डल का, सर्वश्री राजा माइनुद्दीन, मेरुगु गाटाइयाह, बहादुर खान, सरदार खान, डी० सी हरि मोहम्मद गफ्फार, कुन्ता पार्वथायलू, एलगम राजम, सोला सक्षमाइयाह, एम० इसबरी दाम, वाई० हनुमन्थराओ, सरदार खान, माता किस्ताइयाह, केदारी मालाइयाह, आर० भद्राइयाह, ई० वेन्कटी, के० मालाइयाह, शेख याकूब अली और ए० मुरगाइयाह, प्रवर्ग-3 के पम्प खलामियों को 23 मई, 1971 से 29 मई 1971 के सप्ताह के दौरान एक से अधिक पम्प पर काम में लगाना और उन्हें उक्त अवधि के लिए प्रवर्ग 4 की मजदूरी देने से इंकार करना, न्यायोचित है? यदि न्यायोचित नहीं तो उक्त कर्मकार उक्त अवधि के लिए और उन अवधियों के लिए भी जब उन्हें एक से अधिक पम्प पर लगाया गया था, किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?”
- “क्या सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, कोठागुडियम (रामागुंडम डिवीजन-1 और 2) के प्रबन्ध-

मण्डल का, सर्वश्री डी० राधाकृष्णन् कक्षम राजानसू, कोन्डालक्ष्मण, दासी पोशम जंगा च० पोशम घटी-कोंडा राजेशम, निम्माला रामास्वामी, के० वेन्कटी, ओड्डी रायामालू और कामुनी ओडालू प्रवर्ग-2 पम्प खलासियों को, 23 मई, 1971 से 29 मई, 1971 के सप्ताह के दौरान, 35 से अधिक एच० पी० पम्पों पर लगाना और उन्हें उक्त अवधि के लिए प्रवर्ग-3 की मजदूरी देने से इंकार करना, न्यायोचित है? यदि न्यायोचित नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार उक्त अवधि के लिए और उन अवधियों के लिए भी, जब उन्हें एक से अधिक पम्प पर लगाया गया था, किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?

3. "क्या सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, कोठा-गुडियम (रामागुंडयम डिवीजन 1 और 2) के प्रबन्ध-मण्डल का, सर्वश्री पुरान्डाला रामुलू, ए० वेरि-स्वामी, डी० राजामौली, राजा मोहम्मद, जे० सेमुअल, एस० सूर्यनारायना, धोसुदीन, माइडेला, बुरगाइयाह, एल० वेन्कटी, जी० रामालु, इराबाथुला, मुथाइयाह, केन्दुकुरी आगाइयाह और एलूपुला रामुलू, प्रवर्ग-2, पम्प खलासियों को 23 मई, 1971 से 29 मई 1971 के सप्ताह के दौरान, एक से अधिक पम्प पर लगाना और 35 एच० पी० से अधिक पम्पों पर भी लगाना, और प्रवर्ग-4 की मजदूरी देने से इंकार करना न्यायोचित है? यदि न्यायोचित नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार उक्त अवधि के लिए तथा उन अवधियों के लिए भी, जब उन्हें एक से अधिक पम्प पर लगाया गया था, किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?

[संख्या एन-2112/32/71-एल० आर०-2]

New Delhi, the 8th December 1971

S.O. 803.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Bailadilla Iron Ore Project (Deposit No. 14 and 5) of National Minerals Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Kirindul (District Bastar) Madhya Pradesh and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur with headquarters at New Delhi constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the action taken by the management of Bailadilla Iron Ore Project (Deposit No. 14 and 5) of National Minerals Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Kirindul, District Bastar (Madhya Pradesh) in not appointing Shri Mangal Singh as dumper operator was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. L-26012/1/71-LR-IV.]

नई दिल्ली, 8 दिसम्बर, 1971

का० आ० 803.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में नेशनल मिनरल्स डेवलपमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड के बाइलाडिल्ला आयरन और प्राजेक्ट (संचय संख्या 14 और 5) डाकघर, किरिन्दुल (जिला बस्तार) मध्य प्रदेश के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जबलपुर, जिसका मुख्यालय नई दिल्ली में होगा, को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या नेशनल मिनरल्स डेवलपमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड के बाइलाडिल्ला आयरन और प्राजेक्ट (संचय संख्या 14 और 5), डाकघर किरिन्दुल, जिला बस्तार (मध्य प्रदेश) के प्रबन्ध मण्डल की श्री मंगल सिंह को डम्पर ऑपरेटर के रूप में नियुक्त न करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?"

[सं० एल-26012/1/71-एल० आर०-4]

New Delhi, the 9th December 1971

S.O. 804.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Ahmedabad Project, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri I. G. Thakore as Presiding Officer with headquarters at Ahmedabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Industrial Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Oil and Natural Gas Commission, Ahmedabad Project, Sabarmati, Ahmedabad is justified in denying the benefits that are admissible to the regular employees of the Commission to Sarvashri Ashok Kaduskar, Bhikha Bhai Thakar, S. P. Methani, Miss P. A. Mary, Shri Bipin R. Tabkar, with effect from the respective dates of appointment of the employees concerned? If not, to what relief and from what date are they entitled?"

[No. L-30011/6/71-LRIV.]

नई दिल्ली, 9 दिसम्बर, 1971

का० आ० 804.—प्रतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, अहमदाबाद प्रायोजना, साबरमती, अहमदाबाद, के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिस के पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री आई० जी० ठाकुर होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय अहमदाबाद होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त औद्योगिक अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

क्या तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, अहमदाबाद प्रायोजना साबरमती, अहमदाबाद के प्रबन्धक मण्डल का सर्वश्री भूशोक कांडुसकर, भिखा भाई ठाकुर, एस० पी० मेथानी, मिस पी० ए० मेरी, श्री बिपन आर० टाडकार को, सम्बन्धित कर्मचारियों को उनकी नियुक्ति की शारीखों से वे लाभ, जो आयोग के नियमित कर्मचारियों को प्राप्त हैं, देने से इन्कार करना न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो वे किस अनुतोष के और किस तारीख से हकदार हैं ?

[संख्या एल-30011/6/71-एल०आर०-4]

New Delhi, the 10th December 1971

S.O. 805.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Western Kajora Colliery, Post Raniganj, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Western Kajora Colliery, Post Office Raniganj, District Burdwan was justified in retrenching Shri Jogesh Talukdar, Brattice Mistry from the 2nd April, 1971? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

[No. L/1912/133/71-LRII.]

नई दिल्ली, 10 दिसम्बर, 1971

का० आ० यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में वेस्टर्न कजोरा कोलियरी, डाकघर रानीगंज, जिला बर्दवान के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध

नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त वाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का, 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करे हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्याय निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है ।

अनुसूची

"क्या वेस्टर्न कजोरा कोलियरी डाकघर, रानीगंज, जिला बर्दवान के प्रबन्ध मण्डल का श्री जोगेश ताल्लुकदार ब्रिटिस मिस्त्री को 2 अप्रैल 1971 से छुट्टी करना न्यायोचित था ? यदि नहीं तो सम्बन्धित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है ।"

[संख्या एल०/1912/133/71-एल०आर०-2]

S.O. 806.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Lakurka Colliery of Messrs the Lakurka Coal Company Limited, 3 Synagogue Street, Calcutta-1, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Lakurka Colliery of Messrs Lakurka Coal Company Limited, 3 Synagogue Street, Calcutta-1, in terminating the services of Sarvashri Dhananjay Rajwar, Under Ground Trammer and Dwarka Rajwar, Haulage Engine Khalasi with effect from the 14th June, 1971, is justified? If not, to what relief the said workmen are entitled?"

[No. L/2012/184/71-LRII.]

का० आ० 806.—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स दि लाकुरका कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड, की लाकुरका कोलियरी, 3 साइनागांग स्ट्रीट कलकत्ता-1 के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारियों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7(क) के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, (संख्या 1), धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मैसर्स लाकुर्का कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड की लाकुर्का कोलियरी, 3 साइतागांग स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता-1 के प्रबन्ध मण्डल की सर्वश्री धननजाय राजवर, भूमिगत ट्रेम्पर और द्वारका राजवर, हॉलिज इंजन खलासी की 14 जून, 1971 से सेवाएं समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?”

[संख्या एल/2012/184/71-एल०आर०-2]

S.O. 807.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Madhuband Colliery of Messrs Oriental Coal Company Limited, Post Office Nurkharcoe (Dhanbad) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of the Madhuband Colliery of Messrs Oriental Coal Company Limited, Post Office Nurkharcoe (Dhanbad) in stopping the work of Shri Kameshwar Singh, Pump Khalasi (Surface) with effect from the 8th February, 1971, is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

[No. L/2012/142/71-LRIL]

का० आ० 807.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स ओरिएण्टल कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड, की मधुबन्ध कोलियरी, डाकघर नूरखुर्की (धनबाद) के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या-1) धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मैसर्स ओरिएण्टल कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड की मधुबन्ध कोलियरी, डाकघर नूरखुर्की (धनबाद) के प्रबन्ध मण्डल की श्री कामेश्वर सिंह, पम्प खलासी (सतह) को 8 फरवरी, 1971 से काम से रोकने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[संख्या एल-2012/142/71-एल०आर०-2]

S.O. 808.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Bhaladih Sand Line of Messrs Equitable Coal Company Limited, Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Bhaladih Sand Line of Messrs Equitable Coal Company Limited Post Office Dishergarh, District Burdwan in laying off its workmen on the 29th April, 1971, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?”

[No. L/1912/137/71-LRIL]

का०आ० 808.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स ऐक्वीटेबल कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड की भालाडिह सैंड लाइन डाकघर-दिशेरगढ़, जिला बर्दवान के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (2947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मैसर्स ऐक्वीटेबल कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड की भालाडिह सैंड लाइन, डाकघर-दिशेरगढ़, जिला बर्दवान के प्रबन्धमंडल की अपनी कर्मकारों को 29 अप्रैल, 1971 को जबरी छुट्टी देने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो सम्बन्धित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार हैं?”

[सं० एल-1912/137/71-एल०आर०-2]

S.O. 809.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Victoria West Colliery of Messrs New Beerbhoom Coal Company Limited, Post Office Barakar, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Victoria West Colliery of Messrs. New Beerbhoom Coal Company Limited, Post Office Barakar, District Burdwan in dismissing Shri Bhagwan Chamar, Loader with effect from the 27th August, 1971, is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

[No. L/1912/138/71-LRII.]

का० आ० 819.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स न्यू० बीरभूम कम्पनी लिमिटेड की विक्टोरिया वेस्ट कोलियरी,

झाकघर बाराकार, जिला बर्दवान के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद का न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या मैसर्स न्यू बीरभूम कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड की विक्टोरिया वेस्ट कोलियरी, झाकघर बाराकार, जिला बर्दमान के प्रबन्धमंडल की, श्री भगवान चमार, लीडर की 27 अगस्त, 1971 से पदच्युत करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो उक्त कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?"

[संख्या एल-1912/138/71-एल० आर० 82)]

New Delhi, the 13th December 1971

S. O. 810.—WHEREAS the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Sough Jharia Colliery, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

AND WHEREAS the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of South Jharia Colliery, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad in stopping from work the workmen noted below from the dates mentioned against their names is justified? If not, to what relief these workmen are entitled?"

S. No.	Name of the workmen	Designation	Date of stoppage work
1	Gendo Bhuia	Miner	21-1-1971
2	Dhukhan Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
3	Maheshi Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
4	Tapan Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
5	Sohan Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
6	Kali Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
7	Dina Bhuia No. 2	Do.	23-1-1971
8	Bihari Bhuia	Do.	23-1-1971
9	Banshi Bhuia	Do.	22-1-1971
10	Nageshwar Bhuia	Do.	22-1-1971
11	Shankar Bhuia No. 2	Do.	23-1-1971
12	Amtrit Bhuia	Do.	23-1-1971
13	Shiban Bhuia	Do.	20-1-1971
14	Mangar Bhuia	Do.	22-1-1971
15	Bideshi Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
16	Barhan Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
17	Kedar Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
18	Tejo Bhuia	Do.	22-1-1971
19	Giridhari Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
20	Hari Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
21	Jiban Bhuia	Do.	20-1-1971
22	Ramtahal Bhuia	Do.	20-1-1971
23	Ramswaroop Dushadh	Do.	20-1-1971
24	Tulsi Dusadh	Do.	20-1-1971

S. No.	Name of the workman	Designation	Date of stoppage of work
25	Karu Dusadh	Miner	20-1-1971
26	Munilal Kurmi	Do.	21-1-1971
27	Pyari Gope	Do.	21-1-1971
28	Kalu Chamar	Do.	21-1-1971
29	Baleshwar Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
30	Sanichar Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
31	Kamdeo Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
32	Laxman Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
33	Gokul Mahato	Do.	21-1-1971
34	Indradeo Dusadh	Do.	21-1-1971
35	Ram Swarup Dusadh No. 2	Do.	21-1-1971
36	Bhulari Bhuin	Do.	22-1-1971
37	Ranu Bhuia	Do.	22-1-1971
38	Tejo Bhuia No. 2	Do.	30-1-1971
39	Sarjoo Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
40	Deo Nandan Bhuia	Do.	22-1-1971
41	Sanu Bhuia	Do.	22-1-1971
42	Jagdeo Bhuia	Do.	22-1-1971
43	Gobind Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
44	Basu Mochi	Do.	22-1-1971
45	Gangadhar Bauri	Do.	22-1-1971
46	Rangoo Bhuia	Do.	21-1-1971
47	Chamari Dusadh	Trammer	19-1-1971
48	Bundi Halwai	Do.	21-1-1971
49	Chhabhi Nath Mochi	Do.	20-1-1971
50	Jethu Mochi	Do.	19-1-1971
51	Akloo Sao	Do.	20-1-71
52	Barho Dusadh	Do.	21-1-71
53	Baldeo Dusadh	Do.	21-1-71
54	Budhan Bhuia	Do.	21-1-71
55	Baleshwar Bhuia	Do.	19-1-71

[No. L/2012/82/71-LRII.]

मई दिल्ली, 13 दिसम्बर, 1971

का० प्रा० 810.—यतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुभवों में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में साऊथ हरिया कोलियरी, डाकवर हरिया, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्याय निर्णय के लिये निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

यतः, प्रब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 1), धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

पट्टसूची

“क्या साऊथ हरिया कोलियरी, डाकवर हरिया, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धमंडल की निम्नलिखित कर्मचारों को उनके

नामों के सामने लिखी तारीखों से काम से रोकने की कार्य-वाही न्यायोचित है ? यदि नहीं, तो ये कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं ?

क्रमांक सं०	कर्मकार का नाम	पदनाम	काम से रोके जाने की तारीख
1	गेंदो भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
2	पुखान भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
3	महेशी भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
4	टापन भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
5	सोहन भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
6	काली भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
7	दीना भुइया संख्या 2	खनिक	23-1-71
8	बिहारी भुइया	खनिक	23-1-71
9	धंशी भुइया	खनिक	22-1-71
10	नागेश्वर भुइया	खनिक	22-1-71
11	शंकर भुइया संख्या 2	खनिक	23-1-71
12	अमृत भुइया	खनिक	23-1-71
13	शिवन भुइया	खनिक	20-1-71
14	मानगार भुइया	खनिक	22-1-71

क्रमांक	कर्मकार का नाम	पदनाम	काम से रोके जाने की तारीख
15	विदेशी भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
16	बाहान भुइया	खनिके	21-1-71
17	केदार भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
18	तेजो भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
19	गिरिधारी भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
20	हरी भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
21	जिबान भुइया	खनिक	20-1-71
22	रामटहल चड्ढा	खनिक	20-1-71
23	रामस्वरूप दुसाध	खनिक	20-1-71
24	तुलसी दुसाध	खनिक	20-1-71
25	कारू दुसाध	खनिक	20-1-71
26	मुनी लाल कुर्मी	खनिक	21-1-71
27	प्यारी गोप	खनिक	21-1-71
28	कालू चमार	खनिक	21-1-71
29	बालेश्वर भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
30	सनिकर भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
31	कामदेव भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
32	लक्ष्मण भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
33	गोकुल महातो	खनिक	21-1-71
34	इन्द्रदेओ दुसाध	खनिक	21-1-71
35	रामस्वरूप दुसाध संख्या 2	खनिक	21-1-71
36	भूलन भुइया	खनिक	22-1-71
37	रानू भुइया	खनिक	22-1-71
38	तेजो भुइया संख्या 2	खनिक	22-1-71
39	सरजू भुइया	खनिक	22-1-71
40	देओ नन्दन भुइया	खनिक	22-1-71
41	सानू भुइया	खनिक	22-1-71
42	जगदेओ भुइया	खनिक	22-1-71
43	गोविन्द भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
44	बसु मोची	खनिक	22-1-71
45	गंगाधर बाउरी	खनिक	22-1-71
46	रंगू भुइया	खनिक	21-1-71
47	आमारी दुसाध	ट्रैम्पर	19-1-71
48	बूदी हलवाई	ट्रैम्पर	21-1-71
49	छाबी नाथ मोची	ट्रैम्पर	20-1-71
50	जेठू मोची	ट्रैम्पर	19-1-71
51	अकलूसाओ	ट्रैम्पर	20-1-71
52	बरहो दुसाध	ट्रैम्पर	21-1-71
53	बलदेओ दुसाध	ट्रैम्पर	21-1-71
54	दुधन भुइया	ट्रैम्पर	19-1-71
55	बालेश्वर भुइया	ट्रैम्पर	19-1-71

S.O. 811.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Kottadhi Colliery, Post Office Kottadhi, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Kottadhi Colliery of Messrs Equitable Coal Company Limited, Post Office Kottadhi, District Burdwan are justified in not placing Shri Puna Tanti, Machine Mazdoor-cum-Driller in Category-V, as machine Driver with effect from the 1st January, 1971, Shri Ram Gopal Choubay as Boday Searcher in Category-II with effect from the 20th March, 1969 and Shri Lakhu Muchi as Winding Engine Driver in Category-V with effect from the 1st January, 1971? If not to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

[No. L/1912/109/71-LRII.]

कां. आ. 811.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में कोटडाडिह कोलिपरी, डाकघर कोटडाडिह जिला बर्दवान के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विधि अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

क्या मैं सर्स ऐक्वीटेबल कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड की कोटडाडिह कोलिपरी, डाकघर कोटडाडिह जिला बर्दवान के प्रबन्धमंडल की श्री पुनातांती प्रवर्ग-5 में मशीन मजदूर-एवं ड्रिलर को 1 जनवरी 1971 से मशीन चालक श्री रामगोपाल चौबे को 20 मार्च 1969 से प्रवर्ग-2 में बॉडी सर्वर और श्री लखू मूची को 1 जनवरी 1971 से प्रवर्ग-5 में वाइन्डिंग इंजन चालक के रूप में न रखने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुसूची के हकदार हैं?"

[संख्या एल-1912/109/71-एल.आर.-2]

New Delhi, the 15th December 1971

S.O. 812.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Khas

[संख्या एल-2012/82/71- एल.आर.-2]

Badjna Colliery of Messrs Western Bengal Coalfields Limited, Post Office Nirsachatti, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Khas Badjna Colliery of Messrs Western Bengal Coalfields Limited, Post Office Nirsachatti, District Dhanbad, in stopping the workmen Sarvashri Kanai Mandal and Subhas Mandal from the 28th February, 1970 and the 23rd February, 1970 respectively from work was justified? If not to what relief are these workmen entitled?"

[No. 2/95/70-LRII.]

का० आ० 812.—यतः, केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मैसर्स वेस्टर्न बंगाल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, की खास बादजना कोलियरी, डाकघर, निसाचट्टी, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या-1), धनबाद को न्याय-निर्णयन के लिए निदेशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या मैसर्स वेस्टर्न बंगाल कोलफील्ड्स लिमिटेड, की खास बादजना कोलियरी, डाकघर निसाचट्टी, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्धमण्डल की कर्मकार—सर्वश्री कनई मण्डल और सुभासमण्डल को क्रमशः 28 फरवरी, 1970 और 23 फरवरी, 1970 से काम से रोकने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी? यदि नहीं, तो ये कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?"

[संख्या 2/95/70-एल०आर०-2]

S.O. 813.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Pure Kustore Colliery of Messrs Pure Kustore Collieries Company Limited, Post Office Kusunda, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Pure Kustore Colliery of Messrs Pure Kustore Collieries Company Limited, Post Office Kusunda, District Dhanbad, in stopping Sarvashri Amrit Das, Ram Khilavan Das, Nanku and Jethan Bhuia, Miners from work with effect from the 19th March, 1971 is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?"

[No. L/2012/192/71-LRII.]

का० आ० 813.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट कार्यों के बारे में मैसर्स प्योर कुस्तोर कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, की प्योर कुस्तोर कोलियरी, डाकघर कुसुन्डा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या-1), धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है

अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्स प्योर कुस्तोर कोलियरीज कम्पनी लिमिटेड, की प्योर कुस्तोर कोलियरी, डाकघर कुसुन्डा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्ध मण्डल की सर्वश्री अमृतदास, रामखिलावनदास, नन्कू दास और जेथन भूईया, खनिकों को 19 मार्च, 1971 से काम से रोकने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो सम्बन्धित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?"

[सं० एल/2012/192/71-एल०आर०-2]

S.O. 814.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of East Bhuggatdih Colliery of Messrs East Bhuggatdih Colliery Company Private Limited, Post Office Jharua, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication; by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of East Bhuggatdih Colliery of Messrs East Bhuggatdih Colliery Company Private Limited, Post Office Jharra, District Dhanbad, in dismissing Shri Anant Lal Munshi with effect from the 23rd August, 1971, is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

[No. L/2012/191/71-LRII.]

का० आ० 814.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मेसर्स ईस्ट भुग्गातडीह कोलियरी कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड की ईस्ट भुग्गातडीह कोलियरी, डाकघर झरिया, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद के न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 1), धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या मेसर्स ईस्ट भुग्गातडीह कोलियरी कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड की ईस्ट भुग्गातडीह कोलियरी, डाकघर झरिया, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्ध मण्डल की श्री अनन्त लाल मुंशी को 23 अगस्त, 1971 से पदच्युत करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है।"

[संख्या एल०-2012/191/71 एल० आर० 2]

New Delhi, the 16th December 1971

S.O. 815.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Executive Adviser, Messrs East Indian Coal Company Limited and Messrs Bhulanbararee Coal Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the workmen of Bhulanbararee, Jealgora and Bararee Collieries are entitled to any compensation for the period of their lay-off from the Second Shift of the 14th September, 1971 to the First Shift of the 16th September, 1971 and that of the Kendwadhi Colliery for the 16th September, 1971? If so, to what details?"

[No. L/2012/190/71-LRII.]

नई दिल्ली, 16 दिसम्बर, 1971

का० आ० 815.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में कार्यकारी सलाहकार मेसर्स ईष्ट इंडियन कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड और मेसर्स भूलनबाररी कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड, डाकघर जीलगोरा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 1), धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या भूलनबाररी, जीलगोरा और बाररी कोलियरियों के कर्मकार 14 सितम्बर, 1971 की दूसरी पारी से 16 सितम्बर, 1971 की पहली पारी और केन्दवाडिह कोलियरी के कर्मकार 16 सितम्बर, 1971 के लिए उनकी जबरी छुट्टी की अवधि के लिए कोई प्रतिकार पाने के हकदार है? यदि हाँ, तो इसके ब्यौर क्या है?"

[सं० एल/2012/190-एल०आर०-2]

S.O. 816.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Chief Agent, Messrs Oriental Coal Company Limited, Post Office Bhowra, District Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 1), Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bhowra (N), Bhowra (S), Amlabad, Pootkee, Kankanee, Badjna and Madhuband Collieries of Messrs Oriental Coal Company Limited, Central Office Bhowra, Post Office Bhowra, District Dhanbad in refusing sick leave wages for the 1st day of sickness to the concerned workmen vide letter No. Ad/67/6718-40, dated the 26th August, 1970 is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

[No. L/2012/173/71-LRII.]

का० आ० 816.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में मुख्य एजेंट मैसर्स ओरिएण्टल कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड, डाकघर भाउरा, जिला धनबाद के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण (संख्या 1), धनबाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मैसर्स ओरिएण्टल कोल कम्पनी लिमिटेड की भांडरा (एन), भांडरा (एस), अमलाबाद, पूतकी, कानकनी, बादजना और मधुबन्द कोलियरों के प्रबन्धमंडल की पत्र संख्या एड/67/6718-40, तारीख 26 अगस्त, 1970 द्वारा सम्बन्धित कर्मकारों को बीमारी के पहले दिन के लिए बीमारी की छुट्टी की मजदूरी देने से इन्कार करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित थी? यदि नहीं, तो सम्बन्धित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?”

[संख्या एल-2012/173/71-एल०आर 2]

New Delhi, the 24th December, 1971

S.O. 817.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Real Kajora Colliery, Post Office Kajoram, District Burdwan and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Real Kajora Colliery, Post Office Kajoram, District Burdwan in refusing the employment to Sarvashri Sheomurat Harijan and Kaleswar Harijan, Loaders is in accordance with the provisions of clauses b(iii) and b(iv) of the Award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta in Reference Number 35 of 1970, and if not to what relief are the workmen entitled to?”

[No. L/1912/59/71-LRII.]

नई दिल्ली, 24 दिसम्बर, 1971

का० आ० 817.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में रीयल कजोरा कोलियरी, डाकघर कजोराग्राम, जिला बर्दवान के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः अब औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या रीयल कजोरा कोलियरी, डाकघर कजोराग्राम, जिला बर्दवान के प्रबन्ध मंडल की सर्वश्री शिशोमूरत हरिजन और कालेश्वर हरिजन, लोडरों को नियोजन के लिये इन्कार करने की कार्यवाही 1970 के निर्देश संख्या 35 में केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, कलकत्ता के पंचाट के खंड ख (iii) और खंड (iv) के उपबन्धों के अनुसार है और यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?”

[संख्या एल-1912/59/71-एल०आर०]

New Delhi, the 3rd January, 1972

S.O. 818.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Umrer Colliery of National Coal Development Corporation, Post Office Umrer Project, District Nagpur and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central Government Labour Court, Nagpur, constituted under section 7 of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Umrer Colliery of National Coal Development Corporation, Post Office, Umrer Project, District Nagpur in stopping from work Shri Doma, Category-I worker, with effect from the 3rd May, 1970, is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

[No. 5/27/70-LRIL]

BALWANT SINGH, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 3 जनवरी, 1972

SCHEDULE

का० आ० 818— यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषयों के बारे में नेशनल कोल डेवेलपमेंट कारपोरेशन की उमरेर कोलियरी, डाकघर उमरेर प्रोजेक्ट, जिला नागपुर के प्रबन्ध से सम्बद्ध निर्णोजनी और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है ;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार श्रम न्यायालय, नागपुर को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या नेशनल कोल डेवेलपमेंट कारपोरेशन की उमरेर कोलियरी, डाकघर उमरेर प्रोजेक्ट, जिला नागपुर के प्रबन्ध मंडल की, प्रवर्ग-1 के कर्मकार—श्री डोमा को 3 मई, 1970 से काम में रोकने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं, तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[संख्या 5/27/70-एल० आर० 2]

(बलवन्त सिंह)

अवर सचिव।

(Department of Labour and Employment)

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 22nd January 1972

S.O. 819.—Whereas the industrial dispute specified in the Schedule hereto annexed is pending before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Delhi;

And whereas the Union concerned in the dispute has requested the Central Government for the transfer of the case from Delhi to Chandigarh;

And whereas the Central Government considers the request as reasonable;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and sub-section (1) of section 33B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with Shri P. P. R. Sawhney as the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Chandigarh, withdraws the proceedings in relation to the said dispute pending before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Delhi, and transfers the same to the Industrial Tribunal constituted with Shri P. P. R. Sawhney as Presiding Officer thereof and directs that the said Tribunal shall proceed with the said proceedings from the stage at which they are transferred to it and dispose of the same according to law.

Parties to the dispute	Order No. and date	S. O. No. of Gazette and year of publication.
The Central Bank of India and their workmen.	L. 12012/26/71— LRIII dated the 21st October, 1971	5336/71

[No. L. 12012/26/71-LRIII.]

(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 जनवरी, 1972

का० आ० 819 यतः इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट औद्योगिक विवाद केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, दिल्ली के समक्ष लम्बित है।

और यतः विवाद से संबंधित संघ ने केन्द्रीय सरकार से मामले को दिल्ली से चंडीगढ़ अन्तरित करने के लिए निवेदन किया है।

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार के विचार में प्रार्थना युक्तियुक्त है।

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 33ख की उपधारा (1) और धारा 7क द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा औद्योगिक अधिकरण, जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री पी० पी० आर० साहनी होंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय चंडीगढ़ में होगा, गठित करती है और उक्त विवाद से संबंधित कार्यवाही को जो केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण, दिल्ली के समक्ष लम्बित थी, श्री पी० पी० आर० साहनी पीठासीन अधिकारी से गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण को अन्तरित करती है और निदेश देती है। कि उक्त न्यायालय उक्त कार्यवाहियों पर उस प्रक्रम से कार्यवाही करेगा जिस पर वह उसे अन्तरित की गई है और उन्हें विधि के अनुसार निपटाएगा।

अनुसूची

विवाद के पक्षकार	आदेश संख्या और तारीख	राजपत्र की संख्या और प्रकाशन वर्ष	का० आ०
दि सेंट्रल बैंक आफ इंडिया तथा उनके कर्मकार	एल०—12012/26/71 एल० आर० III तारीख 21 अक्तूबर 1971	5336/71	

[सं० एल-12012/26/71 एल आर 3]

New Delhi, the 8th February 1972

S.O. 820.—Whereas a vacancy has occurred in the office of the presiding officer of the Labour Court with headquarters at Bhubaneswar, constituted by the

notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment, No. S.O. 1571, dated the 31st May, 1963;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the provisions of section 8 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Pitamber Jena as the presiding officer of the Labour Court constituted as aforesaid.

[No. F. S. 11025/34/71-L.R.I.]

S. S. SAHASRANAMAN, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 1972

का० आ० 82० यतः भारत सरकार के श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1571 तारीख 31 मई, 1963 द्वारा गठित श्रम न्यायालय, जिसका मुख्यालय बंगलौर है के पीठासीन अधिकारी का पद रिक्त हो गया है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 8 के उपबंधों के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री पीताम्बर जैन को उपर्युक्त रूप में गठित श्रम न्यायालय का पीठासीन अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है ।

[सं० फ० एस० 11025/34/71-एल० आर० 1]

एस० एस० सहस्रनामन, अवर सचिव

(Department of Labour and Employment)

(Office of the Chief Labour Commissioner)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 14th December, 1971

S.O. 821.—Whereas an application has been made under section 19(b) of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 by Messrs Jaipur Udyog Limited (employer) in relation to their establishments mentioned in the Schedule below for extension of the period for the payment of bonus to their employees for the accounting year ending on 31st March, 1971.

And whereas being satisfied that there are sufficient reasons to extend the time I have, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the proviso to clause (b) of Section 19 of the said Act, read with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. WB.20(42)/65 dated the 28th August, 1965, passed order on 10th December, 1971 extending the period for payment of the said bonus by the said employer by 3 months (i.e., up to 29th February 1972) from the last date for payment of bonus under clause (b) of Section 19 of the Act.

Now this is published for information of the employer and all the employees of the said establishment.

THE SCHEDULE

Name and address of the employer (s)	Establishment (s)
M/s. Jaipur Udhog Ltd., Sahu Nagar Sawaimadhopur (Western Railway)	The Jaipur Udyog Ltd., P.O. Phalodi quarry, Distt. Sawaimadhopur (Rajasthan)

[No. BA-6(17)/71-LS.I.]

O. VENKATACHALAM,
Chief Labour Commissioner (Central).

(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

[मुख्य श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय) का कार्यालय]

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 14 दिसम्बर, 1971

का० आ० 821.—यतः मेसर्स जयपुर उद्योग लिमिटेड, (नियोजक) ने नीचे की अनुसूची में वर्णित अपने स्थापनों के सम्बन्ध में 31-3-71 को समाप्त होने वाले लेखा वर्ष के लिए अपने कर्मचारियों को बोनस के संदाय की कालावधि को बढ़ाने के लिए बोनस संदाय अधिनियम, 1965 की धारा 19 (ख) के अधीन आवेदन दिया है ।

और यतः यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि समय बढ़ाने के लिए पर्याप्त कारण हैं, मैंने भारत सरकार के श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० डब्ल्यू० बी० - 20 (42)/65 तारीख 28 अगस्त, 1965 के साथ गठित उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 के खण्ड (ख) के परन्तुक द्वारा मुझे प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए 10-12-71 को उक्त नियोजक द्वारा उक्त बोनस के संदाय की कालावधि को अधिनियम की धारा 19 के खण्ड (ख) के अधीन बोनस के संदाय की अंतिम तारीख से तीन महीने (अर्थात् 29-2-1972 तक) बढ़ाने का आदेश दे दिया है ।

अब इसे उक्त स्थापन के नियोजक और सभी कर्मचारियों की सूचना के लिए प्रकाशित किया जाता है ।

अनुसूची

नियोजक/नियोजकों का नाम और पता	स्थापन
मेसर्स जयपुर उद्योग लि० साहू नगर, सवाई माधोपुर, (वे० रेलवे)	जयपुर उद्योग लि० पो० श्री० फलोदी क्वारी, जिला सवाई माधोपुर, राजस्थान

[सं० बी ए-6(17)/71-एल एस-1]

ओ० वेंकटाचलम,

मुख्य श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय) ।

(Department of Labour and Employment)

(Office of the Chief Labour Commissioner)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 3rd February 1972

S.O. 822.—Whereas an application has been made under section 19(b) of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, by Messrs Timblo Private Ltd., (employer) in relation to their establishments mentioned in the Schedule below for extension of the period for the payment of bonus to their employees for the accounting year ending on 31st March, 1971.

And whereas being satisfied that there are sufficient reasons to extend the time I have, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the proviso to clause (b) of Section 19 of the said Act, read with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour

and Employment No. WB. 20(42)/65 dated the 28th August, 1965, passed order on 12th January, 1972, extending the period for payment of the said bonus by the said employer by 2 months (i.e. up to 31st January, 1972), from the last date for payment of bonus under clause (b) of Section 19 of the Act.

Now this is published for information of the employer and all the employees of the said establishment.

THE SCHEDULE

Name and address of the employer(s)	Establishment(s)
M/s. Timblo Private Ltd., Dignem Mines, Pale Mines, Margao, Goa.	Codli Mines, Curchorem Office, Verlem Mines, Salginim Mines.

[No. BA-6(22)/71-LSI.]

(श्रम और रोजगार विभाग)

(मुख्य श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय का कार्यालय))

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 3 फरवरी 1972

एस० नो० 822.—मैसर्स टिम्ब्लो प्राइवेट लि० (नियोजक) ने नीचे की अनुसूची में वर्णित अपने स्थापनों के संबंध में 31-3-1971 को समाप्त होने वाले लेखा वर्ष के लिए अपने कर्मचारियों को बोनस के संदाय की कालावधि को बढ़ाने के लिए बोनस संदाय अधिनियम, 1965 की धारा 19(ख) के अधीन आवेदन दिया है।

और यतः यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि समय बढ़ाने के लिए पर्याप्त कारण है, मैंने भारत सरकार के श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० डब्ल्यू बी-20(42)/65, तारीख 28 अगस्त, 1965 के साथ पठित उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 के खण्ड (ख) के परन्तुक द्वारा मुझे प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए 12-1-1972 को उक्त नियोजक द्वारा उक्त बोनस के संदाय की कालावधि को अधिनियम की धारा 19 के खण्ड (ख) के अधीन बोनस के संदाय की अंतिम तारीख से दो महीने (अर्थात् 31-1-1972 तक) बढ़ाने का आदेश दे दिया है।

अब इसे उक्त स्थापन के नियोजक और सभी कर्मचारियों की सूचना के लिए प्रकाशित किया जाता है।

अनुसूची

नियोजक/नियोजकों का नाम और पता	स्थापन
मैसर्स टिम्ब्लो प्रा० लिमिटेड, मेरगाओ, गोआ	दिगनम माइन्स, पाले माइन्स, कोडली माइन्स, कर्चोरेम कार्यालय, वरलेम माइन्स, मल्गिनिम माइन्स।

[सं० बी ए-6(22)/71-एल एस-1.]

S.O. 823.—Whereas an application has been made under section 19(b) of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 by Messrs Organisation for the Management of Coking Coal Mines (employer) in relation to their establishments mentioned in the Schedule below for extension of the period for the payment of bonus to their employees for the accounting year ending on March/April 1971.

And whereas being satisfied that there are sufficient reasons to extend the time I have, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the proviso to clause (b) of Section 19 of the said Act, read with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. WB. 20(42)/65 dated the 28th August, 1965, passed order on 11th January, 1972, extending the period for payment of the said bonus by the said employer by minimum of 4 months (i.e. up to 31 March, 1972) from the last date for payment of bonus under clause (b) of Section 19 of the Act.

Now this is published for information of the employer and all the employees of the said establishment.

THE SCHEDULE

Name and address of the employer(s)	Establishment(s)
Organisation for the Management of Coking Coal Mines, P. O. Sijua, Distt. Dhanbad (Bihar).	213 Collieries

[No. BA-6(23)/71-LSI.]

एस० नो० 823.—मैसर्स कोकिंग कोल माइन्स मैनेजमेंट (नियोजक) ने नीचे की अनुसूची में वर्णित अपने स्थापनों के संबंध में मार्च/अप्रैल, 1971 को समाप्त होने वाले लेखा वर्ष के लिए अपने कर्मचारियों को बोनस के संदाय की कालावधि को बढ़ाने के लिए बोनस संदाय अधिनियम, 1965 की धारा 19(ख) के अधीन आवेदन दिया है।

और यतः यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि समय बढ़ाने के लिए पर्याप्त कारण है, मैंने भारत सरकार के श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० डब्ल्यू बी-20(42)/65, तारीख 28 अगस्त, 1965 के साथ पठित उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 के खण्ड (ख) के परन्तुक द्वारा मुझे प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए 11-1-1972 को उक्त नियोजक द्वारा उक्त बोनस के संदाय की कालावधि को अधिनियम की धारा 19 के खण्ड (ख) के अधीन बोनस के संदाय की अंतिम तारीख से चार महीने (कम से कम) (अर्थात् 31-3-1972 तक) बढ़ाने का आदेश दे दिया है।

अब इसे उक्त स्थापन के नियोजक और सभी कर्मचारियों की सूचना के लिए प्रकाशित किया जाता है।

अनुसूची

नियोजक/नियोजकों का नाम और पता	स्थापन
ओरगेनाइजेशन फार दि मैनेजमेंट आफ कोकिंग कोल माइन्स, पी० सिजुआ, जिला धनबाद (बिहार)	213 कोलरीज

[सं० बी० ए/5(30)/71-एल० एस-1.]

New Delhi, the 8th February 1972

S.O. 824.—Whereas an application has been made under section 19(b) of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965 by Messrs Tiffin's Barytes, Asbestos & Paints Ltd., (employer) in relation to their establishments mentioned in the Schedule below for extension of the period for the payment of bonus to their employees for the accounting year ending on 31st March, 1971.

And whereas being satisfied that there are sufficient reasons to extend the time I have, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the proviso to clause (b) of Section 19 of the said Act, read with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. WB. 20(42)/65, dated the 28th August, 1965, passed order on 14th January, 1972 extending the period for payment of the said bonus by the said employer by 2 months (i.e. up to 31st January, 1972) from the last date for payment of bonus under clause (b) of Section 19 of the Act.

Now this is published for information of the employer and all the employees of the said establishment.

THE SCHEDULE

Name and address of the employers	Establishment(s)
M/s. Tiffin's Barytes, Asbestos and Mines at Pulivendla and Paints Ltd., Andhra Chamber Mines and Office at Bellary Building, 272/273, Angappa Naick St. P. B. No. 73, Madras.	

[BA-8(23)/71-LS.I.]

R. J. T. D'MELLO,

Chief Labour Commissioner (Central).

नई दिल्ली, 8 फरवरी, 1972

कां०आ० 824.—यतः मेसर्स टिफिनस बरवाटिस आसबैस्टोस पैन्ट्स लि० (नियोजक) ने नीचे की अनुसूची में वर्णित अपने स्थापनों के संबंध में 31-3-1971 को समाप्त होने वाले लेखा वर्ष के लिए अपने कर्मचारियों को बोनस के संदाय की कालावधि को बढ़ाने के लिए बोनस संदाय अधिनियम 1965 की धारा 19(ख) के अधीन आदेश दिया है।

और यतः यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि समय बढ़ाने के लिए पर्याप्त कारण हैं मैंने भारत सरकार के श्रम और रोजगार मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या डब्ल्यू० बी-20(42)/65 तारीख 28 अगस्त 1965 के साथ पठित उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 19 के खण्ड (ख) के परन्तुक द्वारा मुझे प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए 14-1-1972 को उक्त नियोजक द्वारा उक्त बोनस के संदाय की कालावधि को अधिनियम की धारा 19 के खण्ड (ख) के अधीन बोनस के संदाय को अंतिम तारीख से दो महीने (अर्थात् 31-1-72 तक) बढ़ाने का आदेश दे दिया है।

अब इसे उक्त स्थापन के नियोजक और सभी कर्मचारियों की सूचना के लिए प्रकाशित किया जाता है।

अनुसूची

नियोजक/नियोजकों
का नाम और पता

स्थापन

मेसर्स टिफिन ब्रैट्स, आसबैस्टोस एण्ड माइन्स एंड पेंट्स लि०, आन्ध्र चैम्बर मिनिंग्स माइन्स और आफिस एट 272/273, अंगप्पा नाईक स्ट्रीट, पी० बी० नं० 73, मद्रास।

[सं० बीए-6(23) 71-एल-एस० 1]

(आर० जे० टी० डी०मेलो)

मुख्य श्रम आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय)।

(Department of Rehabilitation)

(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

New Delhi, the 8th December 1971

S.O. 825.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (2) of Section 16 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954, the Central Government hereby appoints for the Union Territory of Delhi, Shri P. N. Oberoi, Managing Officer in the office of Regional Settlement Commissioner (Central), New Delhi as Managing Officer for the custody, management and disposal of Compensation Pool properties with immediate effect.

[No. 7(10)/AGZ/64.]

(पुनर्वास-विभाग)

(मुख्य वन्दोबस्त आयुक्त कार्यालय)

नई दिल्ली, 8 दिसम्बर 1971

एस० ओ० 825.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकार तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम 1954 की धारा 16 की उपधारा (2) का खण्ड (ए) की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रादेशिक वन्दोबस्त आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय) कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली के प्रबन्ध अधिकारी श्री पी० एन० ओबरोय को संघ शासित क्षेत्र दिल्ली के लिये तत्काल ही बन्ध अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है ताकि वे मुआवजा भंडार की समस्तियों का अभिरक्षा, प्रबन्ध तथा निपटारा कर सकें

[सं० 7(10)/एजो जेड/64.]

S.O. 826.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Administration of Evacuee Property Act, 1950, the Central Government hereby appoints for the Union Territory of Delhi, Shri P. N. Oberoi, Managing Officer in the office of the Regional Settlement Commissioner (Central), New Delhi as Assistant Custodian of Evacuee Property for the purpose of discharging the duties assigned to such Asstl. Custodian by or under the said Act, with immediate effect.

[No. 7/10/AGZ/64.]

एस० प्रो० 826—निष्क्रान्त सम्पत्ति प्रशासन अधिनियम 1950 के खण्ड 6 उपखण्ड (1) की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते, केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रादेशिक बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त (केन्द्रीय) कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली के श्री पी० एन० ओबेराय प्रबन्ध अधिकारी को तत्काल ही संघ शासित क्षेत्र दिल्ली के लिये सहायक अभिरक्षक नियुक्त करती है ताकि वे उन कार्यों को कर सकें जो उक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत सहायक अभिरक्षक के पद के लिये निर्धारित किये गये हैं।

[सं० 7/(10)/ए जी जेड/64]

New Delhi, the 16th December 1971

S.O. 827—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the Administration of Evacuee Property Act 1950, the Central Government hereby appoints for the State of U.P., Shri Madan Lal, Asstt. Settlement Officer at Lucknow under the Regional Settlement Commissioner (Central), New Delhi as Asstt. Custodian of Evacuee Property for the purpose of discharging the duties assigned to such officer by or under the said Act, with immediate effect.

[No. 8(67)/AGZ/64.]

नई दिल्ली, 16 दिसम्बर 1971

एस० प्रो० 827—निष्क्रान्त सम्पत्ति प्रशासन अधिनियम 1950 के खण्ड 6 उपखण्ड (1) की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य के लिए प्रादेशिक बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त कार्यालय (केन्द्रीय) नई दिल्ली के सहायक बन्दोबस्त अधिकारी श्री मोहन लाल को सहायक निष्क्रान्त सम्पत्ति अभिरक्षक लखनऊ तत्काल ही नियुक्त करती है ताकि वे उन कार्यों को कर सकें जो उपरोक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत इस पद के ऐसे ही अधिकारियों के लिए निर्धारित किया गया है।

[सं० 8 (67) / ए० जी० जेड/64]

New Delhi, the 27th December 1971

S.O. 828—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section 2 of Section 16 of Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints for the State of Uttar Pradesh, Shri B. N. Shukla, Asstt. Settlement Officer at Lucknow in the office of the Regional Settlement Commissioner (Central), New Delhi, as Managing Officer for the custody, management and disposal of Compensation Pool.

[No. P/F.8/249/ARG/62.]

नई दिल्ली, 27 दिसम्बर 1971

एस० प्रो० 828—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रति कर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 (1954 का 44) की धारा 16, उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (ग) की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रादेशिक बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त कार्यालय (केन्द्रीय) के सहायक बन्दोबस्त अधिकारी श्री बी० एन० शुक्ला, को तत्काल ही लखनऊ के लिये प्रबन्धक अधिकारी नियुक्त किया है ताकि वे संरक्षण प्रबन्ध तथा निपटारा कर सकें, जो प्रतिकर कोश में शामिल हैं।

[सं० पी/एफ० सं० 8/249/ए आर जी/62.]

S.O. 829—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the Administration of Evacuee Property Act, 1950, the Central Government hereby appoints for the State of Uttar Pradesh, Shri B. N. Shukla, Assistant Settlement Officer at Lucknow in the office of Regional Settlement Commissioner (Central), New Delhi as Assistant Custodian of Evacuee Property for the purpose of discharging the duties assigned to such officers by or under the said Act with immediate effect.

[No. P/F.8/249/ARG/62.]

एस० प्रो० 829—निष्क्रान्त सम्पत्ति (प्रशासन) अधिनियम 1950 की धारा 6 उपधारा (1) की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए (केन्द्रीय सरकार उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य के लिये प्रादेशिक बन्दोबस्त (केन्द्रीय) कार्यालय नई दिल्ली के सहायक बन्दोबस्त अधिकारी लखनऊ के, श्री बी० एन० शुक्ला को तत्काल सहायक निष्क्रान्त सम्पत्ति अभिरक्षक नियुक्त करती है ताकि वे उन कार्यों को कर सकें जो इस पद के लिये उपरोक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत निर्धारित हैं।

[सं० पी/एफ सं० 8/249/ए० आर० जी०/62]

New Delhi, the 28th December 1971

S.O. 830—In exercise of the powers conferred on me by sub-section (3) of Section 34 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), I, Janki Nath, Settlement Commissioner hereby delegate my powers to Shri M. P. Misra, Settlement Officer in this office to hear appeal under Section 22 of the said Act.

[No. 6(2)AGZ/64.]

नई दिल्ली 28 दिसम्बर 1971

एस० प्रो० 830—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम 1954 (1954 का 44) की धारा 34 उपधारा (3) की शक्तियां जो मुझे प्रदान की गई हैं उनका प्रयोग करते हुए मैं, जानकी नाथ, बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त, उपरोक्त अधिनियम की अपनी शक्तियां इस कार्यालय के श्री एम० पी० मिश्रा, बन्दोबस्त अधिकारी की प्रदान करता हूँ ताकि वे उपरोक्त अधिनियम की धारा 22 के अन्तर्गत अपील सुन सकें।

[संख्या 6 (2) ए० जी० जेड/(64)]

New Delhi, the 29th December 1971

S.O. 831—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (No. 44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri M. B. Bhalla, Assistant Settlement Officer in the Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner as Settlement Officer for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such officer, by or under the said Act in respect of Compensation and Rehabilitation Grant Applications filed in the erstwhile regions of Bombay and Nagpur, with immediate effect.

[No. P/F.8/53/AGZ/

नई दिल्ली, 29 दिसम्बर 1971

एस० प्रो० 831—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम 1954 (1954 का 44) के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (1) की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार

मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त कार्यालय नई दिल्ली के सहायक बन्दोबस्त अधिकारी श्री एम० बी० भल्ला को तत्काल ही बन्दोबस्त अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है ताकि वे उन कार्यों को कर सकें जो इस पद के अन्य अधिकारियों के लिये उक्त अधिनियम के द्वारा या उसके अन्तर्गत मुआवजा तथा पुनर्वास अनुदान आवेदन पत्रों के बारे में जो कि निष्क्रिय प्रदेश बम्बई तथा नागपुर में दिये गये थे।

[सं० पी/एफ० 8/53/ ए जी जेड/64]

New Delhi, the 31st December 1971

S.O. 832.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5 of the Administration of Evacuee Property Act, 1950 (31 of 1950), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri G. C. Mogha as the Custodian General of Evacuee Property for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such Custodian General by or under the said Act with immediate effect.

[No. 5(4)/Admn. II/72.]

नई दिल्ली, 31 दिसम्बर, 1971

एस० ओ० 833.—निष्क्रांत सम्पत्ति प्रशासन अधिनियम 1950 (1950 के 31) के भाग 5 की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री जी० सी० मोगा को तत्काल प्रभाव से निष्क्रांत सम्पत्ति महापरिरक्षक नियुक्त करती है ताकि वे उन कार्यों को कर सकें जो कि महापरिरक्षक के पद के लिए निर्धारित हैं तथा उपरोक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत हैं।

[संख्या 5 (4)/एडमिन II/72]

S.O. 833.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Claims) Supplementary Act, 1954 (No. 12 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri G. C. Mogha as Chief Settlement Commissioner for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such Chief Settlement Commissioner by or under the said Act with immediate effect.

[No. 5(4)/Admn. II/71.]

एस० ओ० 833.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (दावा) अनुसूक्त अधिनियम 1954 (1954 के 12) की धारा 3 उपधारा (1) की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री जी० सी० मोगा को तत्काल प्रभाव मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त नियुक्त करती है ताकि वह मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त के पद के लिए या उपरोक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत निर्धारित कार्य कर सकें।

[सं० 5(4)एडमिन-II/71]

S.O. 834.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri G. C. Mogha as Chief Settlement Commissioner for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such Chief Settlement Commissioner by or under the said Act with immediate effect.

[No. 5(4)/Admn. II/72.]

एस० ओ० 834.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (मुआवजा तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम 1954 (1954 के 44) की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री जी० सी० मोगा को तत्काल प्रभाव मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त नियुक्त करती है ताकि वे उन कार्यों को कर सकें

जो मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त के पद के लिए व उपरोक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत निर्धारित हैं।

[संख्या 5(4) एडमिन/72]

New Delhi, the 5th January 1972

S.O. 835.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri N. V. Sundara Raman, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Deptt. of Rehabilitation) as Chief Settlement Commissioner for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such Chief Settlement Commissioner by or under the said Act with immediate effect.

[No. 5(4)/Admn. II/72.]

नई दिल्ली, 5 जनवरी, 1972

एस० ओ० 835.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (मुआवजा तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम 1954 (1954 के 44) की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एन० वी० सुन्दरा रमन, संयुक्त सचिव, श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (पुनर्वास विभाग) को तत्काल प्रभाव को मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त नियुक्त करती है ताकि वे उन कार्यों को कर सकें जो मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त के पद के लिये व उपरोक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत निर्धारित हैं।

[संख्या 5(4) /एडमिन II/72]

S.O. 836.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Claims) Supplementary Act, 1954 (No. 12 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri N. V. Sundara Raman, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Deptt. of Rehabilitation) as Chief Settlement Commissioner for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such Chief Settlement Commissioner by or under the said Act with immediate effect.

[No. 5(4)/Admn. II/71.]

एस० ओ० 836.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (दावा) अनुसूक्त अधिनियम 1954 (1954 के 12) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एन० वी० सुन्दरा-रमन, संयुक्त सचिव, श्रम तथा पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (पुनर्वास विभाग) को तत्काल प्रभाव मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त नियुक्त करती है ताकि वह मुख्य बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त के पद के लिए या उपरोक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत निर्धारित कार्य कर सकें।

[संख्या 5(4) एडमिन II/72]

S.O. 837.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5 of the Administration of Evacuee Property Act, 1950 (31 of 1950), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri N. V. Sundara Raman, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation (Deptt. of Rehab.) as the Custodian General of Evacuee Property for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such Custodian General by or under the said Act with immediate effect.

[No. 5(4)/Admn. II/72.]

एस० नो० 837.—निष्कांत सम्पत्ति प्रशासन अधिनियम 1950 (1950 के 31) के भाग 5 की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री एन० बी० सुन्दा-रमन संयुक्त सचिव भ्रम तथा पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (पुनर्वास विभाग) को तत्काल प्रभाव से निष्कांत सम्पत्ति महापरिष्कारक नियुक्त करती है ताकि वे उन कार्यों को कर सकें जो कि महापरिष्कारक के पद के लिए निर्धारित हैं तथा उपरोक्त अधिनियम के अन्तर्गत हैं।

[सं० 5(4)/एडमिन/72]

New Delhi, the 4th February 1972

S.O. 838.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954) the Central Government hereby appoints Superintendent (Gazetted) in the Rehabilitation Department of the Punjab Government as Managing Officer for the purpose of performing, in addition to his own duties as Superintendent (Gazetted) the functions assigned to a Managing Officer by or under the said Act, only for the purpose of recovery and deletions of urban and rural rental demands in respect of acquired urban and rural evacuee properties and urban and rural agricultural lands forming part of the Compensation pool, transferred to the State Government in a "Package deal" or under the administrative and financial arrangements

[No. 3(2)/L&R/69.]

JANKI NATH,
Settlement Commissioner
and Ex-Officio Under Seey.

नई दिल्ली, 4 फरवरी, 1972

एस० नो० 838.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम 1954 (1954 का 44) के खण्ड 3 उपखण्ड (1) की प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार पंजाब राज्य के पुनर्वास विभाग के अधिक्षक (राजपत्रित) को प्रबन्ध अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है ताकि वे अपने अधिक्षक (राजपत्रित) के पद के कार्यों को भी करें जो उक्त अधिनियम के द्वारा या अन्तर्गत प्रबन्ध अधिकारी के पद के लिये केवल बसूली, विलोदन, शहरी और ग्रामीण, माछा सांग आदि अजित शहरी तथा ग्रामीण कृषि भूमि जो प्रतिकर भंडार का भाग है तथा राज्य सरकार को पैकज डील या प्रशासनिक तथा वित्तीय व्यवस्थाओं के अन्तर्गत हस्तान्तरित की गई है।

[सं० 3(2)/एल० एण्ड आर०/69.]

जानकी नाथ,

बन्दोबस्त आयुक्त तथा पदेन अवर सचिव।

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Banking)

New Delhi, the 25th January 1972

S.O. 839.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 21st January, 1972.

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	Notes	17,75,46,000
Reserve Fund	1,50,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	4,08,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long-Term Operations) Fund	1,90,00,00,000	Small Coin	2,91,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	39,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted:—	
National Industrial Credit (Long-Term Operations) Fund	1,35,00,00,000	(a) Internal	15,90,13,000
Deposits:—		(b) External	
(a) Government:—		(c) Government Treasury Bills	54,78,69,000
(i) Central Government	2,29,01,00,000	Balances Held Abroad*	2,03,39,47,000
(ii) State Governments	6,29,07,000	Investments**	77,93,15,000
(b) Banks:—		Loans and Advances to:—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	2,45,58,73,000	(i) Central Government	
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	9,24,03,000	(ii) State Governments@	4,68,45,81,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,90,08,000	Loans and Advances to:—	
(iv) Other Banks	1,44,69,000	(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	1,31,23,75,000
(c) Others	93,74,65,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks††	3,04,85,89,000
		(iii) Others	3,53,00,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long-Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to:—	
		(i) State Governments	42,19,35,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	21,45,16,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	10,55,94,000
		Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	

LIABILITIES	RS.	ASSETS	RS.
		Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	22,05,37,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	76,17,71,000
Bills Payable	40,44,53,000	(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	..
Other Liabilities	3,46,86,66,000	Other Assets	41,17,57,000
	Rupees 1491,53,44,000		Rupees 1491,53,44,000

*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 38,20,00,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

S. JAGANNATHAN,
Governor.

Dated the 25th day of January 1972.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 21st day of January 1972

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	17,75,46,000		Gold Coin and Bullion:—		
			(a) Held in India	1,82,53,11,000	
Notes in circulation	45,52,52,83,000		(b) Held outside India	
Total Notes Issued	45,70,28,29,000		Foreign Securities	2,25,92,00,000	
			TOTAL		4,08,45,11,000
			Rupee Coin		41,28,11,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		41,20,55,07,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper
Total Liabilities		45,70,28,29,000	Total Assets		45,70,28,29,000

S. JAGANNATHAN,
Governor.

Dated the 25th day of January 1972.

वित्त मंत्रालय
(बैंकिंग विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 25 जनवरी, 1972

का०प्रा० 839.—21 जनवरी 1972 को रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये
चुक्ता पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	17,75,46,000
प्रारक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का भिन्नता	4,08,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	190,00,00,000	छोटा भिन्नता	2,91,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि	39,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाए गये विल :-	
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	135,00,00,000	(क) देशी	15,90,13,000
जमा राशियां :-		(ख) विदेशी	..
(क) सरकारी		(ग) सरकारी खजाना विल	54,78,69,000
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	229,01,00,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ नक़्काया*	202,39,47,000
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	6,29,07,000	निवेश**	77,93,15,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अग्रिम :-	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	245,58,73,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	..
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	9,24,03,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को@	468,15,81,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	90,08,000	ऋण और अग्रिम :-	
(iv) अन्य बैंक	44,60,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को†	131,23,75,000
(ग) अन्य	93,74,65,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को††	304,85,89,000
देय बिल	40,44,53,000	(iii) दूसरों को	3,53,00,000
अन्य देयताएं	346,86,66,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण अग्रिम और निवेश	
		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :-	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	42,19,35,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	21,45,16,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को	..
		(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में	10,55,94,000
		निवेश राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	22,05,37,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम	76,17,71,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये बांडों/ डिबेंचरों में निवेश	..
		अन्य आस्तियां	41,17,57,000
रुपये	1491,53,44,000	रुपये	1491,53,44,000

* नकदी, आवधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

** राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

@ राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों को अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

† रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17(4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को मीयादी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये 38,20,00,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

†† राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

तारीख: 25 जनवरी, 1972

एग० जगन्नाथन, गवर्नर।

रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में जनवरी 1972 की 21 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिए लेखा

इशू विभाग

देयताएं	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट	17,75,46,000	सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन	
		(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,11,000
		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ	..
संचयन में नोट	455,52,83,000	विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां जोड़	225,92,00,000 408,45,11,000
जारी किये गये } कुल नोट		रुपये का सिक्का	41,28,11,000
	4570,28,29,000	भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियां	4120,55,07,000
		देशी विनियम बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र	..
कुल देयताएं	4570,28,29,000	कुल आस्तियां	4570,28,29,000

तारीख : 25 जनवरी, 1972

एम० जगन्नाथन, गवर्नर
[मं० फ० 3(3)/बी० सी०/72.]

New Delhi, the 2nd February 1972

S.O. 840.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 28th January, 1972

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	Notes	18,16,55,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	2,38,00,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	190,00,00,000	Small Coin	3,00,00,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	39,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term (Operations) Fund	135,00,00,000	(a) Internal	18,62,43,000
		(b) External
		(c) Government Treasury Bills	34,43,91,000
		Balances Held Abroad*	198,49,86,000
Deposits :—		Investments**	77,19,24,000
(a) Government		Loans and advances to :—	
(i) Central Government	183,92,95,000	(i) Central Government
(ii) State Governments	7,54,98,000	(ii) State Governments@	471,38,49,000

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
(b) Banks :		Loans and Advances to :—	
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks .	245,70,81,000	(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	147,29,30,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	10,02,85,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks††	301,90,85,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	83,13,000	(iii) Others	3,57,00,000
(iv) Other Banks	44,83,000	Loans, Advances and investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(c) Others	93,75,13,000	(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
Bills Payable	61,07,47,000	(i) State Governments	42,18,49,000
Other Liabilities	363,96,97,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks	21,24,94,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	10,55,94,000
		Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
		Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	22,02,37,000
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	76,17,71,000
		(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	
		Other Assets	42,96,66,000
Rupees	1486,29,12,000	Rupees	1486,29,12,000

*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

(†)Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 65,10,00,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

S. JAGANNATHAN,
Governor.

Dated the 2nd day of February 1972.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, for the week ended the 28th day of January 1972.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held on the Banking Department	18,16,55,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation	4537,61,70,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,11,000	
Total Notes issued		4555,78,25,000	(b) Held outside India	
			Foreign Securities	238,65,38,00	
			TOTAL	421,18,49,000	
			Rupee Coin	41,78,00,000	
			Government of India Rupee Securities	4092,81,76,0000	
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper	
TOTAL LIABILITIES		4555,78,25,000	TOTAL ASSETS		4555,78,25,000

Dated the 2nd day of February 1972.

S. JAGANNATHAN,
Governor.
[No. F. 3(3)-B.C./72.]

नई दिल्ली, 2 फरवरी, 1972

का० आ० 840.—28 जनवरी, 1972 को रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताएं	रुपये	अस्तित्वां	रुपये
शुक्ता पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	18,16,55,000
भारक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	2,38,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	190,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का	3,00,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थितिकर) निधि	39,00,00,000	खरीदे श्रीह भुनाये गये बिल:—	
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि	135,00,00,000	(क) देशी	18,62,43,000
जमा राशिया :		(ख) विदेशी
(क) सरकारी		(ग) सरकारी खजाना बिल विदेशों में रखा	34,43,91,000
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	183,92,95,000	हुआ बकाया*	198,49,86,000
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	7,54,98,000	निवेश**	77,19,24,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अग्रिम:—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	245,70,81,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	10,02,85,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को†	171,38,49,000
(iii) गैर अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	83,13,000	ऋण और अग्रिम:—	
(iv) अन्य बैंक	44,83,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को*	147,29,30,000
(ग) अन्य	93,75,13,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को**	301,90,85,000
देय बिल	61,07,47,000	(iii) दूसरों को	3,57,00,000
अन्य देयताएं	363,96,97,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश	
		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	42,18,49,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	21,24,94,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों को
		(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिबन्धक बैंकों के डिबेंचरों में निवेश राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थितिकरण) निधि से ऋण और अग्रिम	10,55,94,000
		राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	22,02,37,000
		राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम	76,17,71,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये गये बाडो/ डिबेंचरों में निवेश
		अन्य अस्तित्वां	42,96,66,000
	रुपये 1486,29,12,000		रुपये 1486,29,12,000

*नकदी, अवैधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

**राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

†राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं; परन्तु राज्य सरकारों के अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

*रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया अधिनियम की धारा 17(4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को सीमावी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गए 65,10,000/- रुपये शामिल हैं।

**राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएं) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थितिकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

तारीख : 2 फरवरी, 1972

एस० जगन्नाथन, गवर्नर।

रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में जनवरी, 1972 की 28 तारीख को समाप्त हुए सप्ताह के लिये लेखा

इशू विभाग

देयताएं	रुपये	रुपये	अस्तित्वा	रुपये	रुपये
बैंक विभाग में रक्के हुए नोट	18,16,55,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन.— (क) भारत में रक्खा हुआ (ख) भारत के बाहर रक्खा हुआ	182,53,11,000 ..	
संचलन में नोट	45,37,61,70,000		विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां	238,65,38,000	
जारी किये गये कुल नोट		45,55,78,25,000	जोड़ रुपये का सिक्का भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियां देणी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य-पत्र		421,18,49,000 41,78,00,000 40,92,81,76,000 ..
कुल देयताएं		45,55,78,25,000	कुल आस्तियां		45,55,78,25,000

एस० जगन्नाथन,
गवर्नर ।

तारीख 2 फरवरी, 1972

[सं० 3 (3)-बी०सी०/72]

New Delhi, the 9th February 1972

S. O. 841.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 4th February, 1972

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5,00,00,000	Notes	15,06,20,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	5,29,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	190,00,00,000	Small Coin	2,69,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	39,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted:—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	135,00,00,000	(a) Internal	20,67,30,000
Deposits:—		(b) External	16,18,73,000
(a) Government		(c) Government Treasury Bills	196,38,63,000
(i) Central Government	158,24,33,000	Balances Held Abroad*	74,47,04,000
(ii) State Governments	10,19,85,000	Investments**	447,14,67,000
(b) Banks		Loans and Advances to:—	
		(i) Central Government
		(ii) State Governments@	162,87,64,000
		Loans and Advances to:—	301,97,19,000
		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	3,68,00,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks††
		(iii) Others
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	..
		(a) Loans and Advances to:—	..
		(i) State Governments	42,18,48,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	21,08,42,000

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	237,53,61,000	(ii) Central Land Mortgage Banks
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	10,55,94,000
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	9,36,75,000	Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund :	
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	83,13,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	21,88,32,000
(iv) Other Banks	36,06,000	Loans Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
(c) Others	82,77,32,000	(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	76,17,71,000
Bills Payable	69,70,61,000	(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	..
Other Liabilities	366,92,04,000	Other Assets	44,51,45,000
RUPES	14,54,93,70,000	RUPES	145,4,93,70,000

*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary over drafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 63,85,00,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

P. N. DAMRY,
Dy. Governor.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 for the week ended the 4th day of February, 1972

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	15,06,20,000		Gold Coin and Bullion—		
Notes in circulation	45,83,11,91,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,11,000	
Total Notes issued		45,98,18,11,000	(b) Held outside India	
			Foreign Securities	238,65,38,000	
			TOTAL		421,18,49,000
			Rupee Coin		39,17,14,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities		41,37,82,48,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper
Total Liabilities		45,98,18,11,000	Total Assets		45,98,18,11,000

P. N. DAMRY,
Dy. Governor,

[No. 1. 3(3)-BC/72.]

K. YESURATNAM, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 9 फरवरी, 1972

क.० आ. 841.—4 फरवरी, 1972 को रिजर्व बैंक आफ इण्डिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकलाप का विवरण

देयताय	रुपये	अस्तित्वां	रुपये
चुक्ता पूंजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	15,06,20,000
प्रारक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	5,29,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण		छोटा सिक्का	2,69,000
(दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि	190,00,00,000	खरीदे और भुनाये गये बिल :—	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण		(क) देशी	20,67,30,000
(स्थिरीकरण) निधि	39,00,00,000	(ख) विदेशी
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण		(ग) सरकारी खजानाबिल	16,18,73,000
(दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि	135,00,00,000	विदेशों में रखा हुआ बकाया*	196,38,63,000
जमा राशियां :—		निवेश**	74,47,04,000
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	..
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	158,24,33,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	
(ii) राज्य सरकारें	10,19,85,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को†	447,14,67,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	237,53,61,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को‡	162,87,64,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	9,36,75,000	(i) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	301,97,19,000
(iii) गैर- अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी		(iii) दूसरों को	3,68,00,000
बैंक	83,13,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें)	
(iv) अन्य बैंक	36,06,000	निधि से ऋण अग्रिम और निवेश	
		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम :—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	42,18,48,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	21,08,42,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमि बन्धक बैंकों को
(ग) अन्य	82,77,32,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमि बन्धक बैंकों के	
		डिबेंचरों में निवेश	10,55,94,000
		राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरण निधि	
		से ऋण और अग्रिम	
देय बिल	69,70,61,000	राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को ऋण और अग्रिम	21,88,32,000
अन्य देयतायें	366,92,04,000	राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन	
		क्रियायें) निधि से ऋण, अग्रिम और निवेश	
		(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और अग्रिम	76,17,71,000
		(ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किये	
		बांडों/डिबेंचरों में निवेश
		अन्य अस्तित्वां	44,51,45,000
रुपये	1454,93,70,000	रुपये	1454,93,70,000

*नगदी, आवधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिभूतियां शामिल हैं।

**राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि और राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि में से किये गये निवेश शामिल नहीं हैं।

†राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं, परन्तु राज्य सरकारों के अस्थायी ओवरड्राफ्ट शामिल हैं।

‡रिजर्व बैंक आफ इण्डिया अधिनियम की धारा 17(4) (ग) के अधीन अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों की मीयादी बिलों पर अग्रिम दिये गये 63,85,00,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियायें) निधि और राष्ट्रीय ऋण (स्थिरीकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और अग्रिम शामिल नहीं हैं।

तारीख : 9 फरवरी, 1971

पी० एन० उमरो, उप-गवर्नर।

रिजर्व बैंक ऑफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1935 के अनुसरण में फरवरी, 1972 की 4 तारीख को समाप्त हुये सप्ताह के लिये लेखा
दशू विभाग

देयतायें	रुपये	रुपये	आस्तियां	रुपये	रुपये
बकिंग विभाग में रखे हुये नोट	15,06,20,000		सोने का सिक्का और बुलियन :— (क) भारत में रखा हुआ .	182,53,11,000	
संचलन में नोट	4583,11,91,000		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ विदेशी प्रतिभूतियां .	238,65,38,000	
			जोड़ .		421,18,49,000
जारी किये गये कुल नोट		4598,18,11,000	रुपये का सिक्का .		39,17,14,000
			भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रतिभूतियां .		4137,82,48,000
			देशी विनिमय बिल और दूसरे वाणिज्य- पत्र .		..
कुल देयतायें		4598,18,11,000	कुल आस्तियां .		4598,18,11,000

तारीख : 9 फरवरी, 1972

पी० एन० डमरी,
उप-गवर्नर ।

[सं० फा० 3(3)-बी० सी०/72]

के० पेसुरत्नम, अवर सचिव ।

(Department of Banking)

New Delhi, the 7th February 1972

S.O. 842.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 8 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (2 of 1934), the Central Government hereby nominates the following persons as directors of the Central Board of the Reserve Bank of India.

1. Dr. B. Datta, 1/1-K, Jodhpur Park, Calcutta-31.

2. Shri S. M. Joshi, 1170, Sadashiv Peth, Poona-30.

[No. F. 3(6)-BC/72.]

D. N. GHOSH,
Director.

(बैंकिंग विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 7 फरवरी 1972

का० प्रा० 842.—भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक अधिनियम 1934 (1934 का 2) की धारा 8 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ग) में प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक के केन्द्रीय बोर्ड के लिए नीचे लिखे व्यक्तियों को निदेशक मनोनीत करती है :—

1. डा० बी० दत्त,
1/1-के, जोधपुर पार्क, कलकत्ता-31
2. श्री एस० एम० जोशी,
1170, सदाशिव पथ,
पूना-30

[संख्या एफ० 3(6)-बी० सी०/72]

डी० एन० घोष,
निदेशक ।

(Department of Revenue and Insurance)

INCOME TAX

New Delhi, the 5th January, 1972

S.O. 843.—It is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by the Indian Council of Social Science Research, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (iii) of sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), upto 31st March, 1975, subject to the following conditions:—

1. The Bhavan should maintain a separate account of all the funds received u/s. 35(1)(iii) of the Income-tax Act, 1961 and should utilise them exclusively for promotion of social science research. The funds may be earmarked for maintenance of Bhavan's Munshi Institute of Social Science Research and also for support of research programmes in the other institution affiliated thereto.

2. An annual report of the activities of Bhavan for promotion of social science research may be submitted to Indian Council of social science Research. New Delhi.

Institution

BHARATIYA VIDYA BHAVAN, BOMBAY.

[No. 9 (F. No. 203/6/71-ITA.II.)]

S. N. NAUTIAL, Dy. Secy.

(राजस्व और वीमा विभाग)

आयकर

नई दिल्ली, 5 जनवरी, 1972

एन० ओ० 843.—सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए एतद्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 35 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (iii) के प्रयोजनों के लिए विहित प्राधिकारी, भारतीय समाज-विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद् द्वारा, 31 मार्च, 1975 तक, निम्नलिखित संस्था का अनुमोदन किया गया है, जो निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन होगा :

1. भवन, आयकर, अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 35(i) (iii) के अधीन प्राप्त सभी निधियों का पृथक् लेखा रखेगा और उसे उनका उपयोग केवल समाज-विज्ञान अनुसंधान के संप्रवर्तन के लिए करना चाहिए। निधियां भवन के मुंशी/समाज-विज्ञान अनुसंधान संस्थान के अनुरक्षण के लिए और उससे सम्बद्ध अन्य संस्था में अनुसंधान कार्यक्रमों को वहावा देने के लिए अलग रखी जाएं।

2. समाज विज्ञान अनुसंधान के संप्रवर्तन की वास्तव भवन के क्रियाकलापों की एक वार्षिक रिपोर्टें भारतीय समाज-विज्ञान अनुसंधान परिषद्, नई दिल्ली को दी जाए।

संस्था

भारतीय विद्या भवन, मुम्बई

[सं० 9 (फा० सं० 203/6/71-आई० टी० ए० II.)]

एस० एन० नौटियाल, उपायुक्त।

(Central Board of Excise and Customs)

CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 4th March, 1972

S.O. 844.—In pursuance of the powers conferred by section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby declares Kundara in the State of Kerala to be a warehousing station.

[No. 32/72-Cus./F. No. 473/43/71-Cus. VII.]

K. SANKARARAMAN, Under Secy.,

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क बॉर्ड

सीमा-शुल्क

नई दिल्ली, 4 मार्च, 1972

एन० ओ० 844.—सीमा-शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क बॉर्ड एतद्वारा केरल राज्य में कुण्डारा को भाण्डागार स्टेशन घोषित करता है।

[सं० 32/72-सीमाशुल्क/फा० सं० 47343/71-सीमा० VII]

के० शंकररामन, उवर सचिव।

MINISTRY OF WORKS AND HOUSING

New Delhi, the 5th February 1972

S.O. 845.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section 2 of section 52 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957 (61 of 1957), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Health, Family Planning and Urban Development (Department of Health and Urban Development) (No. S.O. 652 (File No. 18011(28)/67-UD), dated the 14th February, 1969, the Central Government hereby directs that the powers of that Government under the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 22 of the said Act shall, subject to the control of the Central Government and until further orders, also be exercised by the administrator of the Union territory of Delhi in respect of lands covered by the scheme for large scale acquisition, development and disposal of land in Delhi contained in the letter of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs No. F. 37/16/60-Delhi (i) dated the 2nd May, 1961.

[No. K-11011(15)/71-UDI.]

R. K. CHIF, Under Secy.

निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 5 फरवरी, 1972

एन० ओ० 845.—दिल्ली विकास अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 61) की धारा 52 की उप-धारा 2, द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा भारत सरकार के स्वास्थ्य परिवार नियोजन तथा नगर विकास मंत्रालय (स्वास्थ्य तथा नगर विकास विभाग) की दिनांक 14 फरवरी, 1969 की अधिसूचना एस० ओ० 652 (फाइल संख्या 18011 (28)/67-यू० डी०) के क्रम में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा यह निदेश देती है, कि उक्त अधिनियम

की धारा 22 की उपधारा (1) के उपबंधों के अन्तर्गत उस सरकार की शक्तियाँ केन्द्रीय सरकार के नियंत्रण के अधीन रहते हुए तथा अगला आदेश जारी होने तक, दिल्ली में भूमि के बड़े पैमाने पर अर्जन, विकास और निपटान की योजना में आनेवाली भूमि के बारे में दिल्ली के संघ क्षेत्र के प्रशासक द्वारा भी प्रयोग में लाई जायेंगी, जसे कि भारत सरकार के गृह मंत्रालय के दिनांक 2 मई, 1961 के पत्र संख्या फ० 37/16/60-दिल्ली (i) में निहित है।

[सं० के-11011(15)/71-यू० डी० I.]

आर० के० चिद, प्रवर सचिव।

(Directorate of Estates)

New Delhi, the 24th February 1972

S.O. 846.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act 1971 (40 of 1971), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply (Department of Works and Housing) Nos. S.O. 3430 dated the 20th September, 1967 and S.O. 1647 dated the 4th May, 1968, the Central Government hereby appoints the officers mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being officers equivalent to the rank of gazetted officers of Government to be estate officers for the purposes of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on the estate officers by or under the said Act, within the local limits of their respective jurisdictions in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table.

THE TABLE

Designation of the Officer	Categories of public premises and local limits of jurisdiction
(1)	(2)
Executive Officers and Tehsildars (Assessment), Delhi Development Authority	Premises belonging to the Delhi Development Authority whether such premises are in possession of or leased out by the said Authority or the premises belonging to the Central Government placed at the disposal of the Delhi Development Authority.

[No. F. 21012(5)/67-Pol(IV)]

(संपरा निदेशालय)

नई दिल्ली, 24 फरवरी, 1972

का० आ० 846.—लोक परिसर (अनधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के भूतत्पूर्व निर्माण, आवास और पूर्ति मंत्रालय (निर्माण और आवास विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 3430 तारीख 20 सितम्बर, 1967 और का० आ० 1647 तारीख 4 मई, 1968 को अधिकांत करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ 1 में उल्लिखित अधिकारियों को, सरकार के राजपत्रित अधिकारियों की रैंक के समतुल्य अधिकारी होने के

नाते, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए एतद्वारा सम्पदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है, जो उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ 2 में विनिर्दिष्ट लोक परिसरों के सम्बन्ध में अपनी अपनी अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर, उक्त अधिनियम के द्वारा या उसके अधीन सम्बद्ध अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेंगे और उन पर अधिरोपित कर्तव्यों का पालन करेंगे।

सारणी

अधिकारी का पदाभिधान	लोक परिसरों के प्रयोग और अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाएं
(1)	(2)

कार्यपालक अधिकारी और तहसीलदार (निर्धारण), दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण	दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण के स्वामित्व के परिसर, वे चाहे उक्त प्राधिकरण के कब्जे में हो या उसके द्वारा पट्टे पर दे दिये गये हों, अथवा केन्द्रीय सरकार के ऐसे परिसर जो दिल्ली विकास प्राधिकरण के नियन्त्रणाधीन हों।
--	---

[सं० फा० 21012(5)/67-नीति (IV)]

S.O. 847.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being gazetted officer of Government, to be estate officer for the purpose of the said Act, who shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed, on estate officer by or under the said Act, within the local limits of his jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in the corresponding entry in column (2) of the said Table.

THE TABLE

Designation of the Officer	Categories of Public Premises and local limits of jurisdiction
Assistant Director (Civil), Central Power Research Institute, Bangalore.	Premises including buildings, hutments, kutchas houses structures standing thereon belonging to or taken on lease by and under the administrative control of the Director, Central Power Research Institute, Bangalore.

[No. F. 21011(4)/66-Pol. (IV)]

P. N. KHANNAH,
Deputy Director of Estates and
Ex-Officio Under Secy.

का० आ० 847.—लोक परिसर (अनधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, नीचे दी गई सारणी के स्तम्भ 1 में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, सरकार का राजपत्रित अधिकारी होने के नाते, उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों

के लिए एतद्द्वारा सम्पदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है, जो उक्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (2) में की तत्सम्बन्धी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट लोक परिसर के सम्बन्ध में अपनी अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाओं के भीतर, उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा या उसके अधीन सम्पदा अधिकारी को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा और उस पर अधिरोपित कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा।

सारणी

अधिकारी का पदाभिधान लोक परिसरों के प्रवर्ग और अधिकारिता की स्थानीय सीमाएं

सहायक निदेशक (सिविल), निदेशक, केन्द्रीय विद्युत अनुसंधान केन्द्रीय विद्युत अनुसंधान संस्थान, बंगलौर के या उसके द्वारा पट्टे पर लिये गये या उसके प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण में के, परिसर/जिनमें उस पर बने भवन, हटमेण्ट्स, कच्चे मकान और सरचनाएं भी हैं।

[सं० एक० 21011(4)/66-नीति IV]

पी० एन० खन्ना,

उप सम्पदा-निदेशक तथा पदेन अवसर सचिव, भारत सरकार।

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 5th February 1972

S.O. 848.—In pursuance of section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951), the Election Commission hereby publishes the judgment delivered on the 21st December, 1971 by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad in Election Petition No. 6 of 1971.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD CIVIL SIDE

ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

Dated Allahabad, the 21st day of December, 1971

PRESENT:

The Hon'ble W. Broome,—Judge.

ELECTION PETITION No. 6 OF 1971.

Mohd Yunus Saleem—Petitioner.

Versus

Sri Shiva Kumar Shastri and others—Respondents.

By THE COURT

ELECTION PETITION No. 6 OF 1971

Hon'ble Broome J.

This election petition, filed by Mohammad Yunus Saleem, the defeated Congress (R) candidate, challenges the election of the B.K.D. candidate Shiva Kumar Shastri (respondent No. 1) to the Lok Sabha from the Aligarh Parliamentary Constituency in March, 1971.

This constituency consists of five segments, viz. Aligarh, Koil, Iglas, Khair and Chandaus; and the poll was scheduled to take place in Aligarh and Koil on 1st March, 1971 and in Iglas, Khair and Chandaus on 3rd March, 1971. The polling in the first two segments went off peacefully on 1st January, 1971; and the figures given in the petition show that the petitioner was then leading by a substantial majority. But on 2nd March, 1971 a communal riot between Hindus and Muslims took place in Aligarh city and as a result of this the Election Commission, acting on reports made by the local authorities at Aligarh, postponed the poll in the remaining three segments from 3rd March, 1971 to 9th March, 1971. The voting in these three segments went heavily in favour of Shiva Kumar Shastri, with the result that he won the election.

The petitioner's contention is that the communal riot was deliberately engineered by his political rivals, with the help of the B.K.D. Government which happened to be in power in Uttar Pradesh at the time. He further suggests that the recommendation made by the local authorities to the Election Commission, which resulted in the adjournment of the poll originally fixed for 3rd March, 1971, was mala fide and that the postponement was procured in order to give the anti-congress (R) parties an opportunity to influence voters in the remaining three segments of the constituency by spreading false versions about the Aligarh riots, along with the defamatory allegations against the petitioner. A number of meetings are said to have been held at various places in the Iglas, Khair and Chandaus areas on 7th March, 1971 and 8th March, 1971, at which speeches were made blaming the petitioner for the riots and rousing anti Muslim feelings by giving lurid accounts of atrocities said to have been committed on Hindus by Muslims in the course of the riots. Appeals are said to have been made to Hindus and specially to Jats and Thakurs to vote for Shiva Kumar Shastri, so as to ensure that the Muslim candidate (the petitioner) should not be elected. And at certain places Muslim voters are said to have been threatened in order to deter them from voting.

Another grievance of the petitioner is that one of the other candidates, Puran Singh Malan (respondent No. 2), who belong to the S.S.P. and was contesting the election on behalf of the four-party alliance composed of the Congress (O), Jan Sangh, S.S.P. and Swatantra, was induced to retire from the contest on 6th March, 1971 by the offer of a bribe.

The Chief Election Commissioner has been arrayed in this petition as a respondent and has filed a written statement, though no relief has been claimed against him.

On the pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed:—

1. Whether the appointment of the District Magistrate of Aligarh as Returning Officer or the constituency concerned by the Election Commission was void.
2. Whether the order of the Election Commission adjourning the poll from 3rd March to 9th March was without jurisdiction and illegal.
3. Whether this Court has jurisdiction to adjudicate in respect of the appointment of the Returning Officer and the adjournment of the poll.
4. Whether the Election Commissioner has been improperly impleaded as respondent in this petition.
5. Whether Puran Singh Malan (respondent No. 2) withdrew from the election on 8th March and asked his supporters to vote instead for respondent No. 1. If so, was this done as a result of inducement offered at the instance of respondent No. 1?

6. Whether respondent No. 1 and his supporters engineered a communal riot in Aligarh on 2nd of March in order to spoil the petitioner's chances in the poll that was to be held in Iglas, Khair and Chandaus.
7. Whether voters were induced by threats offered by Hukum Singh, the polling agent of respondent No. 1, to promise not to vote for the petitioner but to vote for respondent No. 1 (as detailed in paragraph 28 of the petition).
8. Whether respondent No. 1 and Kalyan Singh, M.L.A., Appealed to Hindu voters in Goraa village on 7th March, 1971 not to vote for the petitioner because he was a Muslim (as detailed in para 29 of the petition); and whether similar appeals were made to voters by respondent No. 1 and Prakash Vir Shastri, Virendra Verma, Raghunath Singh and Ram Prasad Deshmukh in Khair, Chandaus and Iglas between 7th March, 1971 and 9th March, 1971 (as detailed in para 30 of the petition).
- 8A. Whether respondent No. 1 and the other persons named in paragraph 30 of the petition and the statement of further particulars made speeches in Khair, Chandaus and Iglas 'tehsils' alleging that the petitioner was responsible for communal riots in Aligarh and other places, which statements were known by them to be false.
9. Whether Virendra Verma and Raghunath Singh appealed to Jat voters to vote for respondent No. 1 on the ground that he was the candidate of a party led by Sri Charan Singh (As detailed in para 30 of the petition).
10. Whether respondent No. 1's election agent Yogendra Pal Singh and Virendra Verma and Charan Singh appealed to Jat and Thakur voters at Iglas on 7th March, 1971 not to vote for the petitioner as he was a Muslim and not to allow Muslim, Jatav and Brahmin voters to vote (as detailed in para 34 of the petition).
11. Whether at the same meeting (mentioned in para 34) Yogendra Pal Singh falsely stated that the petitioner was a Razakar of Hyderabad and had instigated the Aligarh riots.
12. Whether respondent No. 1 has committed corrupt practices as defined in clauses (1), (2), (3), (3A) and (4) of the section 123 of the representation of the People Act.
13. To what relief, if any, is the petitioner entitled?

Findings

Issue No. 1.—At the time of arguments learned counsel for the petitioner stated that this issue had been given up. It is accordingly decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 3.—This issue raises the question of whether this Court has jurisdiction to adjudicate in respect of (a) the appointment of the Returning Officer and (b) the adjournment of the Poll. With the giving up of issue No. 1, no decision need be given with regard to the appointment of the Returning Officer and issue No. 3 is thus now confined to the second question. Learned counsel appearing for the Chief Election Commissioner has stated that he does not challenge the jurisdiction of the court to decide whether the Election Commission was legally empowered to adjourn the poll from 3rd March, 1971 to 9th March, 1971 (covered by issue No. 2); but he contends that the question of whether in the particular circumstances of this case the Election Commission was justified in adjourning the poll is not justiciable. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, has not attempted to argue that in the event of the Election Commission being held to have the legal power to fix a fresh date for the poll, the adequacy of the material on which the Commission arrived at its decision to order postponement in a particular case could be gone into. It has no doubt

been urged in the course of arguments that the evidence on record suggests that there was no real justification for the adjournment of the poll in the present case; but the Court's attention was drawn to this aspect of the evidence only with a view to bolstering up the contention that Parliament could not possibly have seen fit to entrust the Election Commission with any such power of adjournment, because it could be so easily misused on the basis of tendentious reports and mala fide recommendations made by persons under the control of an interested State Government. I find therefore that there is no controversy in the present case regarding the scope of the Court's jurisdiction and that this issue is consequently unnecessary and calls for no decision.

Issue No. 4.—Learned counsel appearing for the Chief Election Commissioner contends that the Commissioner has been wrongly impleaded in this case; but it seems to me that even though the Commissioner was not a necessary party, his impleadment cannot be held to be unjustified or improper. It is true that no relief has been claimed against him; but since one of the main questions raised in the petition was whether the Election Commission was legally empowered to alter the date of poll once it had been fixed under section 30 of the representation of the People Act, he was impleaded in order to give him an opportunity to come forward and advance arguments on this vitally important point, if he should wish to do so.

The issue is accordingly decided in favour of the petitioner.

Issue No. 2.—By means of the notification (Exh. 1) published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary dated the 27th January, 1971, the Election Commission, acting under section 30 of the Representation of the People Act, fixed 3rd February, 1971 as the last date for making nomination in the election, 4th February, 1971 as the date for the scrutiny of nominations, 6th February, 1971 as the last date for the withdrawal of candidatures, various dates between 1st March, 1971 and 5th March, 1971 for holding the poll in different constituencies in Uttar Pradesh and 15th March, 1971 as the last date before which the election should be completed. The precise dates fixed in this notification for the poll in the Aligarh constituency were 1st March, 1971 in the Aligarh and Koil segments and 3rd March, 1971 in the Iglas, Khair, and Chandaus segments. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that once these polling dates had been fixed under clause (d) of section 30, they could not be changed by the Election Commission or any other authority except in the circumstances mentioned in sections 57 and 58 of the Act. Section 57 empowers the Presiding Officer at any particular polling station to adjourn the poll, if the proceedings are interrupted or obstructed by any riot or open violence, or if it is not possible to take the poll on account of any natural calamity or any other sufficient cause. And section 58 empowers the Presiding Officer to make a report to the Election Commission for the holding of a fresh poll, if any ballot box is taken away, destroyed or lost or if some error in procedure, likely to vitiate the poll, is committed at the polling station. The powers granted by both these sections, it is to be noted, are exercisable only on the actual date fixed for the poll; and action thereunder can be initiated by the Presiding Officer alone. The argument put forward on behalf of the petitioner is that these sections indicate that the Legislature intended to confine the power of adjournment to the circumstances enumerated therein. It is further contended that the Representation of the People Act contains no provisions empowering the Election Commission to act *suo motu* in the matter of adjournment of the polls and that once the power to fix the dates of the poll has been exercised under clause (d) of section 30, that power is exhausted and no fresh date can be fixed (except in the special cases covered by section 57 and 58).

The first point that calls for decision is whether the provisions of the Representation of the People Act are

such as to negate the possibility of the Election Commission passing any order for the postponement of a poll in circumstances other than those for which provisions has been made in sections 57 and 58. In this connexion both parties have relied on section 153 of the Act, which runs as follows:—

"153. It shall be competent for the Election Commission for reasons which it considers sufficient to extend the time for the completion of any election by making necessary amendments in the notification issued by it under section 30 or sub-section (i) of section 39."

According to the petitioner this relates only to changing the date fixed under clause (e) of section 30 i.e. "the date before which the election shall be completed", and therefore by implication excludes the possibility of changing "the date or dates on which a poll shall, if necessary, be taken", fixed under clause (d) of section 30. But learned counsel for the respondent contends that when section 153 permits the Election Commission to "extend the time for the completion of any election", it means that it can extend the time for the completion of any integral process of the election, such as the taking of the poll. It is clear that "election" does not necessarily mean only the final declaration of the result, for as pointed out by the Supreme Court in *N. P. Pannuswami v. The Returning Officer, Namakhal Constituency, Namakhal and others* (A.I.R. 1952 Supreme Court 64):

"the word" election "can be and has been appropriately used with reference to the entire process which consists of several stages and embraces many steps....

The meaning to be assigned to the word "election" in section 153, therefore, must be gathered from the context of the section and from the scheme of the Act. Judging from the context, I am of opinion that the interpretation suggested by learned counsel for the respondent is to be preferred. In the first place section 153 refers to section 30 as a whole, without any distinction of clauses, whereas if it had been intended to declare the Election Commission competent to amend only the date fixed under clause (e) of section 30, there seems to be no reason why the Legislature should not have specified this. And secondly, section 153 speaks of amendments in the plural, whereas if only the date fixed under clause (e) of section 30 was to be changed, a single amendment would be all that was needed. The wording of section 153 therefore suggests that the phrase "extended the time for completion of any election" is meant to refer not only to the extension of the final date but also to the extension of dates fixed for any stage of the election. This does not of course mean that the Election Commission can extend the time for making nominations, for the scrutiny of nominations or for the withdrawal of candidatures, because the wording of clause (a); (b) and (c) of section 30 is absolutely rigid and excludes the possibility of fixing any alternative dates. But clause (d) of section 30 merely lays down what the earliest date for taking the poll shall be and makes no attempt to prescribe the last date for polling. There is thus considerable flexibility in clause (d); and section 153 can be construed as declaring the competence of the Election Commission to extend time under clause (d) as well as under clause (e) of section 30.

I am not impressed by the argument that sections 57 and 58 of the Act exclude by necessary implication the power of the Election Commission to postpone a poll. Under Article 324 of the Constitution the Election Commission is entrusted with the superintendence, direction and control of the conduct of elections. This implies that the Commission must take all necessary measures to ensure that a proper and fair poll is taken in every election; and it seems to me that if the Commission becomes satisfied that on account of some circumstance that has supervened since the original date of polling was fixed, a fair poll cannot be taken on that original date, it is the overriding duty of the Com-

mission to fix a fresh date for the poll. It is extremely doubtful whether the powers necessary for the performance of the Commission's duties under Article 324 can be taken away or whittled down by any ordinary statute. Article 327, which confers on Parliament the power to make provision with respect to elections, has been expressly made "Subject to the provisions of this Constitution", which means of course that it is subject to Article 324; and any Act which deprived the Election Commission of its control of elections under Article 324 would be of doubtful constitutional validity. Articles 324 and 327 should no doubt be read together harmoniously; but the most that can be said is that Parliament is competent to prescribe the mode in which the Election Commission should discharge its functions, but cannot prohibit or nullify the discharge of those functions. In the present case, however, it is unnecessary to consider the consequences of a clash between Article 324 and the provisions of an Act passed by Parliament under Article 327, for I can find nothing in the Representation of the People Act, 1951, that runs counter to Article 324. The mere fact that sections 57 and 58 have provided a procedure for postponing a poll on account of circumstances supervening on the very date of the poll cannot to my mind give rise to any inference that the Legislature intended to forbid the postponement of a poll by the Election Commission on account of circumstances arising before the date of the poll has been reached. It is impossible for a Legislature to visualise all possible combinations of circumstances; and if provisions is made in an Act to meet one set of circumstances, that does not mean that every other set of circumstances has been taken into consideration and deliberately excluded. As pointed out by a Division Bench of this Court in *Moti Lal v. Mangala Prasad and other* (A.I.R. 1958 Allahabad 794).

"But where the Act itself omits to provide for a contingency and does not contain any provisions for meeting the situation the general power conferred upon the Election Commission by Art. 324 (1) of the Constitution will come into play, and the Commission will have a right to pass the necessary orders, if they fall within the ambit of its powers, enumerated in Art. 324(1) of the Constitution a poll should be held or not at a particular polling station is one which falls under the words 'conduct of an election'."

These remarks were no doubt obiter, since the learned Judges refrained from giving any "final opinion" on the point, but I find myself in respectful agreement with the view here expressed. Learned counsel for the petitioner has tried to argue that the power to adjourn a poll is not a power that can be derived from Article 324; and in this connexion he has placed reliance on *Baburao Patel and others v. Dr. Zahir Hussain and others* (A.I.R. 1968 Supreme Court 904). But in that case the Supreme Court merely held that Article 324 did not confer on the Election Commission the power to prescribe an oath for a candidate. Prescribing an oath would not be part of the functions assigned to the Commission to direct and control the conduct of election; but adjourning a poll in order to secure a fair and proper election would obviously come within the ambit of those functions.

An attempt has been made to argue that the provisions of section 30 read with section 31 of the Act show that the power to fix a date for the poll under clause (d) of section 30 can be exercised only once. Section 31 runs as follows:—

"31. On the issue of a notification under section 30, the returning officer shall give public notice of the intended election in such form and manner as may be prescribed", inviting nominations of candidates for such election and specifying the place at which the nomination papers are to be delivered."

And rule 3 of the Conduct of Election Rules, 1961 lays down that the public notice issued under this section shall be in Form I, which mentions not only the name

and other particulars of the constituency, the date and time for presentation of nomination papers, and the date fixed for scrutiny thereof but also the date when the poll will be taken in the event of the Election being contested. The contention is that since the notice issued under section 31 makes a mention of the polling dates fixed under section 30, those dates cannot be changed without issuing a fresh notice under section 31; and since there is no provision in the Act for any such fresh notice, it is argued that the Act does not contemplate any re-fixing of polling date once they have been notified under section 30. This argument, however, loses sight of the nature and purpose of the public notice issued under section 31. It is clear from a perusal of that section that the notice is issued for the specific purpose of inviting nominations; and there can be no question of issuing such a notice for a second time, inviting fresh nominations, because, as already pointed out, the provisions of clauses (a) and (b) of section 30, which relate to the fixing of the dates for making nominations and for their scrutiny, are absolutely rigid and permit of no variation. It is clear that the Act does not envisage the issue of more than one notice under section 31 in respect of any election, because nominations can be called for only once; and there can be no question of issuing any fresh notice under section 31 merely because the polling dates have been changed, even in those cases where the poll is adjourned in the circumstances set forth in sections 57 and 58. I am satisfied therefore that the argument advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner on the basis of section 31 is entirely without force.

Similarly, I see no force in the other argument put forward on the petitioner's behalf that the Legislature could not possibly have entrusted the Election Commission with the power to adjourn the polls, because such power would be open to abuse. As already pointed out, the provisions of the Act regarding fixation of the dates of polling are by no means rigid, since the Act itself provides for the fixation of fresh dates under section 57 and 58, if circumstances supervening on the date originally fixed for the poll render this necessary. And if the legislature could entrust the power of an adjournment under section 57 to the Presiding Officer, who could be a person directly under the control of the State Government, there seems to be no reason why the Legislature should not have seen fit to allow the Election Commission, which is of superior status and far less amenable to extraneous influences, to retain similar powers of adjourning the poll in cases where it is satisfied that circumstances have arisen which render such adjournment necessary.

When the Act contains no provision that negates the power of the Election Commission to alter the dates fixed for a poll under section 30(d), the Commission clearly has that power by virtue of the principle set forth in section 21 of the General Clauses Act, 1897, which states:—

"21. Where, by any Central Act or Regulation, a power to issue notifications, order, rules or bye-laws is conferred, then that power includes a power, exercisable in the like manner and subject to the like sanction and conditions (if any), to add to, "amend, vary or rescind any notifications, orders, rules or bye-laws so issued."

Section 30(d) of the Representation of the People Act confers on the Election Commission the power to appoint the date or dates on which a poll shall be taken; and it follows from Section 21, quoted above, that the Election Commission must also have the power to add to, amend, vary or rescind such notification, provided of course that in doing so it does not run counter to any other provision of the Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that section 21 of the General Clauses Act cannot be invoked in respect of the power conferred by section 30(d) of the Representation of the People Act, because the notifications and orders referred to therein must be

confined to those which are of a legislative character or amount of subordinate legislation. Ordinary executive or administrative orders, it is urged, are not governed by section 21. In this connection my attention has been invited to a number of reported cases, but none of them seems to lend any support to the argument. The ruling cited relate to judicial orders, to orders creating a vested interest (such as appointment to a post) and to cases in which the application of section 21 would run counter to the general scheme of the statute or to specific provisions in the statute. In cases like the present, where these factors are not to be found, I can see no justification for excluding the operation of section 21, even though the orders or notifications in question may be purely executive or administrative. As pointed out by learned counsel for the respondent, the Supreme Court in *Gopi Chand vs. Delhi Administration* (A.I.R. 1959 Supreme Court 609) has held section 21 to be applicable to orders of an administrative nature passed under the East Punjab Public Safety Act; and similarly in *State of Madhya Pradesh and others V. Vishnu Prasad Sharma and others* (A.I.R. 1966 Supreme Court 1593) it was held to be applicable to orders under section 4 or section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act. Further more, a Division Bench of the Calcutta High Court, dealing with the specific case of postponement of an election, has held that the power to fix a date for election must be taken to include the power to postpone any date so fixed, in view of the provisions of section 22 of the Bengal General Clauses Act, *vide Bhuvan Mohan Basak and others V. Chairman, Dacca Municipality and others* (A.I.R. 1927, Calcutta 704).

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further tried to show that section 21 of the General Clauses Act is not applicable in the circumstances of the present case, because the power to amend, vary or rescind a notification or order under section is exercisable only "subject to the like sanction and conditions." He points out that the power given to the Election Commissioner under section 30 (d) of the Representation of the People Act to fix dates for the poll is to be exercised "as soon as the notification calling upon a constituency to elect a member or members is issued," and he contends that a second order fixing a fresh date for the poll could only be passed, if there was a fresh notification issued under section 14 of the Act. But I see no substance in this line of argument, for when fresh dates for the poll were fixed in the present case on 2nd March, 1971, the original notification under section 14, calling upon the constituency to elect a member, was still in force and must be deemed to have remained in force until the whole process of election was completed. No necessity for the issue of any fresh notification under section 14 could arise in the circumstances; and I am satisfied that no such change in the relevant "conditions" had occurred upto 2nd March, 1971, that might prevent the Election Commission from exercising its power under section 21 of the General Clauses Act to amend or vary the date previously fixed for the poll.

My findings under this issue therefore, are: (1) that the Election Commission has the power to adjourn a poll in the discharge of its functions under Article 324 of the Constitution and that there is nothing in the Representation of the People Act to prevent it from exercising such power; (2) that even under the provisions of the Act itself the Election Commission has the power to change the date of poll fixed under section 30(d), in accordance with the principle set forth in section 21 of the General Clauses Act; and (3) that section 153 of the Act empowers the Election Commission to extend the date of poll fixed under clause (d) of section 30 as well as the date for completion of the entire procedure of the election under clause (e). This issue is accordingly decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 5.

We now come to the issue relating to the corrupt practice of bribery, defined in section 123(1)(A) of the Representation of the People Act. The case set up by

the petitioner is as follows. At about 7 P.M. on 6th March, 1971, there was a meeting at the Aligarh residence of K. N. Agarwal (said to be one of the financiers of the B.K.D. party in the election), which was attended by Shiv Kumar Shastri (respondent No. 1). Puran Singh Malan (respondent No. 2); Virendra Varma (Home Minister of the U.P. Government, Surendra Kumar (another alleged financier of the B.K.D. party) and a number of other persons. One Atma Deo Sharma stood up and made an appeal to Shastri and Malan that only one of them should for election and thereupon Shastri, Malan and Surendra Kumar went into an adjoining room, where Surendra Kumar offered to pay Rs. 30,000/- to Rs. 35,000/- to Malan if he would withdraw from the contest, while Shastri told Malan that he would recommend him for a seat in the Legislative Council. On this Malan said that he had no need of money and as regards the seat in the Council, that was for the future to decide, but as they were all asking him to withdraw, he would comply. The three of them then joined the others and Malan announced his withdrawal and requested his supporters to transfer their allegiance to Shastri.

The main evidence relied upon by the petitioner to substantiate the story is the testimony of Devendra Pal Singh (P.W. 20), who claim to have attended the meeting and to have gone into the adjoining room with Shastri, Malan and Surendra Kumar and to have been present when the offers were made to Malan by Surendra Kumar and Shastri. He is corroborated to some extent by Radha Raman Dhvaj Prasad Singh (P.W. 21), who also claims to have attended the meeting, though he did not go into the adjoining room and was not present at the actual offer of the bribe. In addition, there is the statement of Shashi Bhushan, M.P. (P.W. 32), who claims to have met Malan in Aligarh on 7th March, 1971, and to have asked him why he was spolling his political career by withdrawing from the election, whereupon Malan told him that Shastri had promised him a seat in the Legislative Council.

The contesting respondent denies all these allegations and pleads that not only was no bribe offered to Malan but that in actual fact Malan did not withdraw from the contest and continued to fight the election to the end. Both the respondents Shiv Kumar Shastri and Virendra Varma have come into the witness-box (as P.Ws. 14 and 7) to swear that no meeting was attended by them at K. N. Agarwal's on 6th March, 1971, and that no offer of money or a seat in the Legislative Council was ever made to Malan in their presence or within their knowledge.

Before coming to a discussion of the factual aspect of this issue, I must deal with a legal argument advanced on behalf of the contesting respondent, viz., that even if any gratification was offered to Malan on 6th March, 1971, to induce him to refrain from contesting the election, that would not amount to a corrupt practice as defined in section 123 (1) (A), which runs:—

"23. *Corrupt Practices*.—The following shall be deemed to be corrupt practices for the purposes of this Act:—

(I) 'Bribery', that is to say,—

(A) any gift, offer or promise by a candidate or his agent or by any other person with the consent of a candidate or his election agent of any gratification, to any person whomsoever, with the object, directly or indirectly of inducing—

(a) a person to stand or not to stand as, or to withdraw or not withdraw from being a candidate at an election."

The charge in the present case is that the offer was made to Malan to induce him "to withdraw from being a candidate." But the contention is that "to withdraw from being candidate" "must be the same "withdrawal

of candidature", dealt with in section 37 of the Act, which permits a candidate to withdraw by delivering a notice in writing before three O' clock in the afternoon on the day fixed under clause (c) of section 30; and since the alleged offer of gratification in the present case was made at 7 P.M. on 6th March, 1971, when the time fixed under section 30(c) had already expired there was no possibility of his withdrawing his candidature then and the offer could not be construed as an inducement to him to withdraw. Learned Counsel for the petitioner, on the other hand, maintains that the words "to withdraw from being a candidate", used in section 123 (1) (A) (a) should be interpreted in a wide sense, as meaning "to refrain from contesting the election", without reference to the specific kind of formal withdrawal mentioned in section 37. At first sight this interpretation would seem to have much to commend it, since it avoids the anomalous distinction between an inducement to refrain from fighting the election offered before 3 P.M. on the date fixed under section 30(c), which is to be treated as a corrupt practice, entailing serious consequences, and a similar inducement offered after the expiry of that time limit which would be completely innocuous. But learned counsel for the respondent has drawn my attention to the provisions of section 123 as they stood before the Act was amended in 1958. At that time the definition of bribery ran as follows:—

"123. *Corrupt Practices*.—The following shall be deemed to be corrupt practices for the purposes of this Act:—

(I) Bribery that is to say—any gift, offer or promise by a candidate or his agent or by any other person, of any gratification to any person whomsoever, with the object, directly or indirectly of inducing—

(a) a person to stand or not to stand as or to withdraw from being a candidate or to retire from contest, at an election."

This clearly shows that the Legislature had drawn a distinction between the words "to withdraw from being a candidate" and the words "to retire from contest"; and it is obvious that in this context, the words "to withdraw from being a candidate" must be assigned the restricted meaning of "withdrawal from candidature" mentioned in section 37.

However, even if the interpretation of section 123 (1) (A) (a) offered by learned counsel for the petitioner were to be accepted, the petitioner would still not succeed on this issue, because the evidence relied upon by him for the purpose of proving the alleged offer of gratification to Malan is hopelessly inadequate and unconvincing. The sole witness who claims to have been present when the offer was made, Devendra Pal Singh (P.W. 20), does not inspire any confidence, for there seems to be no reason why he should have accompanied Shastri, Malan and Surendra Kumar into the adjoining room, where the bribe is said to have been offered. He does not say that he was invited to accompany the others and he played no part in the discussion that took place but was a mere silent spectator. He claims to have been one of Shastri's workers, but did not hold any important post and could scarcely have been in a position to persuade Malan to accept the bribe. It has been suggested that he may have had some influence over Malan because both of them were Jats; but if an influential Jat was required to be present, surely Virendra Varma the Home Minister of the U.P. Government who is also a Jat, would have been chosen in preference to this witness. Devendra Pal Singh has switched his allegiance from the B.K.D. to the Congress (R) in September 1971 and I strongly suspect that he has given false evidence in this case in order to ingratiate himself with his new masters and win their patronage. The corroborating witnesses are equally unreliable. Radha Raman Dhvaj Prasad Singh (P.W. 21) pretends that

he is still a B.K.D. workers, although he has come to depose against the B.K.D. candidate with a view to getting him unseated. He is moreover indebted to the Aligarh co-operative Bank, which is now under Congress (R) control, and significantly admits that no steps have been taken so far for the realisation of the loan. The testimony of Shashi Bhushan (P.W. 32) is inherently improbable, for he was in no way intimate with Pooran Singh Malan, having met him only two or three times, and it is difficult to believe that on casual meeting him in the street for the second or third time, Malan could have divulged to him the secret of the alleged offer by Shastri of a seat in the Legislative Council. Furthermore, whatever little evidentiary value may attach to the depositions of Devendra Pal Singh, Radha Raman and Shashi Bhushan stands completely rebutted by the statements of Virendra Varma and Shiv Kumar Shastri (P.Ws. 7 and 14), who swear that the whole story of the meeting at K. N. Agarwal's house on 6th March, 1971, is fictitious and false.

The result is that both on law and on the facts the petitioner has failed to establish that any corrupt practice of bribery was committed by or with the consent of respondent No. 1. The issue is decided accordingly against the petitioner.

Issue No. 6.

This issue was given up by learned counsel for the petitioner at the time of arguments and is accordingly decided in the negative, against the petitioner.

Issue No. 7.

This issue relates to the corrupt practice of undue influence, defined in section 123 (2) of the Representation of the People Act. The allegations put forward by the petitioner in this connection are that on 7th March, 1971, just two days before the poll, the respondent Shiv Kumar Shastri visited the village of Sapera and after collecting a number of Hindus at the Chaupal of the Sarpanch Hukum Singh, went along with them to the Muslim quarter of the village and by means of threats forced the Muslim voters of that place to swear on the Quran that they would vote for him and not for the petitioner or any other candidate. After the Muslim had taken the oath Shastri is alleged to have warned them that if they did not act in accordance with this oath they would be in danger of divine displeasure.

The witnesses relied on by the petitioner for substantiating these allegations are Raghubir Singh (P.W. 11), Rafiq (P.W. 14) and Shiva Dan Singh (P.W. 15), all of whom are residents of Sapera. Raghubir Singh and Shiv Dan Singh claim to have been called to the Chaupal of Hukum Singh, where they met Shiv Kumar Shastri, and then to have gone along with him to the Muslim quarter, where in their presence the Muslims were forced to swear on the Quran that they would vote for Shastri; and Rafiq is one of the persons who was made to take the oath in this fashion. In rebuttal we have the testimony of the respondent Shiv Kumar Shastri himself (P.W. 14), who denies ever having gone to Sapera during the election period, and of Hari Singh (P.W. 8), the son of the Sarpanch Hukum Singh, who denies that Shastri came to the village and that the Muslims were forced to take an oath on the Quran.

None of the three witnesses produced by the petitioner inspires me with any confidence. Both Raghubir Singh and Shiv Dan Singh admit that they are Congress supporters and had been supporting the Congress in the election, but claim that on account of Shastri's visit to the village on 7th March, 1971, they turned over to him. This assertion on their part is significant, for it suggests that they began to support Shastri after having seen him coerce the Muslims of the village into swearing an oath on the Quran in the manner alleged. This can only mean that they approved or at any rate did not disapprove of this conduct

on Shastri's part; but now they have come forward to give evidence against Shastri on this very account. They are now so enthusiastic in their opposition against Shastri that they have come to Court without being summoned; and Raghubir Singh has even gone so far as to say that he has paid his own fare from Aligarh and his own hotel expenses in Allahabad; Shiv Dan Singh says that he came because he met a Congress "neta" called Babu Lal Bansal in Harduaganj a month earlier and was told by him to go to Allahabad and give evidence "that he had not heard any quarrel and that he was going to vote for the cow and calf" (with no reference to the present story of the coercion of the Muslims into taking an oath on the Quran). The remaining witness Rafiq is of low status, and he too was sent to court to give evidence by a Congress supporter, one Dr. Iqbal, who he had met in Harduaganj a month earlier. I am unable to place any reliance on the testimony of witnesses of this calibre, and their statements stand satisfactorily rebutted by the evidence of Shiv Kumar Shastri and Hari Singh.

No case under section 123 (2) has been made out. This issue is accordingly decided against the petitioner.

Issue 8, 8A, 9, 10 and 11.

These issues, based on the allegations contained in paragraphs 29, 30 and 34 of the petition, are interconnected and it will be convenient to dispose of them together. The allegations are that a number of meetings were held at various places on 7th March, 1971, and 8th March, 1971, at which speeches were made either by the respondent Shiv Kumar Shastri or by his agents and helpers, in the course of which lurid accounts were given of the atrocities said to have been committed by Muslims on Hindus in the Aligarh riots of 2nd March, 1971, and false accusations were levelled against the petitioner to the effect that he was a Razakar of Hyderabad and had been responsible for the Aligarh riots. Appeals are said to have been made to the voters not to vote for the petitioner because he was a Muslim; and in some instances Jat speakers like Virendra Varma are said to have appealed to Jat voters to vote for Shiv Kumar Shastri, because he was the candidate of the B.K.D. a party led by Sri Charan Singh. These issues thus relate to the commission of corrupt practices under clauses (3), (3-A) and (4) of section 123 of the Act.

Evidence has been led in respect of five of these alleged meetings, which are as follows:—

- (1) A meeting held in Jatari village at 10 A.M. on 7th March, 1971, at which Mahendra Singh, Yogenendra Pal Singh (Shastri's election agent) and Virendra Varma (Home Minister) were the speakers. This is deposed to by Bed veer Singh (P.W. 16) and Gobardhan Singh (P.W. 17).
- (2) A meeting held in Gordha village at 3 P.M. on 7th March 1971, at which Shiv Kumar Shastri, Nem Singh Chauhan and Kalyan Singh, M.L.A. are said to have spoken. This is deposed to by Kesho Deo Harvana (P.W. 6), Khacharu Lal (P.W. 8), Subedar Singh (P.W. 9), and Anand Pal (P.W. 10).
- (3) A meeting held in Iglas at 8 P.M. 7th March, 1971, at which the speakers are said to have been Ramesh Chand, Virendra Varma and Yogenendra Pal Singh. Four witnesses have deposed about this meeting, namely Gajendra Singh (P.W. 18).
- Ram Das Singh (P.W. 19), Kishan Singh (P.W. 23), and Brij Lal Sharma (P.W. 31).
- (4) A meeting held in Gabhana Village at 11 A.M. on 8th March, 1971, at which speeches are said to have been made by Shiv Kumar Shastri and Prakash Vir Shastri (General Secretary

of the B.K.D.). The witnesses deposing to this meeting are Raj Kumar Singh (P.W. 24), Om Bir Singh (P.W. 25), Chaitanya Raj Singh (P.W. 26) and Deo Datt Bharadwaj (P.W. 29).

- (5) A meeting held in the village of Beswa at 12.30 midday on 8th March, 1971, at which Pooran Singh Malan, Yogendra Pal Singh and Virendra Varma are said to have spoken. This is deposed to by Radha Raman Dhawaj Prasad Singh (P.W. 21) and Har Charan Lal (P.W. 22).

Rebutting evidence has been produced by the contesting respondent regarding each one of these alleged meetings. Apart from other witnesses, at least one of the person alleged to be the Chief speakers on each occasion has been examined to deny the allegations: Virendra Varma (P.W. 7) in the case of the Jatari, Iglas and Baswa meetings and Shiv Kumar Shastri (R.W. 14) in respect of the meetings at Gordha and Gabhana. In addition we have Mahendra Singh (R.W. 3) and Kali Charan (R.W. 4) denying the story about the Jatari meeting; and similar denials have been made about the Gordha meeting by Nem Singh Chauhan (R.W. 5) and Jaipal Singh (R.W. 6), about the Iglas meeting by Virendra Singh (R.W. 9) and Ramesh Chandra (R.W. 10) about the Gabhana meeting by Jodhpal Singh (R.W. 11) and Raghunath Prasad Sharma (R.W. 12) and about the Beswa meeting by Virendra Singh (R.W. 9).

Regarding all these alleged meetings I find the petitioner's evidence to be of very poor quality. Two witnesses who depose to the Jatari Incident, Bed Veer Singh and Goverdhan Singh (P.Ws. 16 and 17) are Congress supporters who have come to Court at the instance of a certain congress worker (also named Bed Veer Singh) and P.W. 17 was so enthusiastic about coming to give evidence that he insisted on paying his own fare from Aligarh. Their testimony, such as it is, stands effectively rebutted by Mahendra Singh and Virendra Varma (R. Ws. 3 and 7), both of whom are alleged to have spoken at the Jatari meeting. Mahendra Singh (an M.L.A. from the Khair constituency) was in Jatari on 7th March, 1971, but flatly denies that any meeting was held there on that date, while Virendra Varma (the then Home Minister of the U.P. Government) denies having gone to Jatari at all that day. Kali Charan (R.W. 4), a shopkeeper of Jatari, also denies that any meeting sponsored by the B.K.D. was held there in the week preceding the date of the Poll. In this state of the evidence I have no hesitation in holding that the petitioner's allegations regarding the Jatari meeting remain totally unsubstantiated.

Similar is the case with the Gordha meeting. Kesho Deo Harayana (P.W. 6) was a prominent Congress (R) worker who was canvassing for Yunus Saleem throughout the election period, yet he made no written report or complaint either to the election authorities or anyone else about the unlawful propaganda that he claims to have heard being put forward at the said meeting. He says he orally reported the affair to his local President, who made a note in a file, but no attempt has been made to produce or prove that document. Khacheru Lal, Subedar Singh and Anand Pal (P.Ws. 8, 9 and 10), though very specific about the speeches they claim to have heard at Gordha on 7th March, 1971, are extremely vague about other features of the election campaign: Khacheru Lal cannot say which party sent representatives to his village to canvass votes, nor can he name any one who came for that purpose, while the other two witnesses are unable to give the gist of other speeches which they heard apart from the ones of Gordha. The respondent has successfully rebutted this weak evidence by examining two of the persons alleged to have spoken at this meeting viz. himself (R.W. 14) and Nem Singh Chauhan (R.W. 5). Both of them have denied being in Gordha at all on 7th March, 1971; and in addition we have the statement of

Jaipal Singh (R.W. 6), a shopkeeper who was in Gordha Bazar on the day in question, to the effect that no meeting was held there that day between 10 A.M. and 5 P.M.

Now we come to the Iglas meeting, alleged to have been held there at the Jawahar Inter College at 8 P.M. on 7th March, 1971. Two of the four witnesses produced by the petitioner to depose about this, viz. Gajendra Singh and Ram Das Singh (P. Ws. 18 and 19), who were active workers of the B.K.D. party, state that on hearing the allegations against Yunus Saleem and the Muslims of Aligarh, they were so impressed that they then proceeded to carry on this very propaganda in the villages, day and night, in furtherance of Shastri's election campaign. They still claim to be in favour of the B.K.D. party, even now, and it is difficult to understand in the circumstances now they have come forward to give evidence in the present case with the object of unseating the successful B.K.D. candidate. Gajendra Singh said he had come to Court on the request of the petitioner, Yunus Saleem, whom he met in Delhi purely by chance, because he accompanied someone who happened to be going to the petitioner's house. Ram Das Singh said he had come to Court merely because he had been served with a summons, without being asked by anyone to give evidence; and he tried to show his independence by asserting that he had even paid his own expenses. I am unable to place any reliance on witnesses such as these. Nor are the other two any better. Kishan Singh (P.W. 23) is a member of the Aligarh District Congress Committee and claims to have deliberately gone to the meeting organised by the rival party in order to find out what was being said; yet he made no report about the unlawful propaganda carried on at this meeting to the election authorities. This witness further admits that he was aware of the fact that the very meeting itself was illegal, since it was being held within 48 hours of the time fixed for the close of the polling; but even about this he made no report. Brij Lal Sharma (P.W. 31), the principal of a local school, was also a Congress (R) support, but he too made no report to anyone; and he is so enthusiastic about coming to depose for the petitioner in this case, that he has paid his own expenses and has declared that he will not claim reimbursement, as he considers deposing in this case to be a meritorious act. The unreliability of the petitioner's allegations regarding this alleged Iglas meeting stands further more revealed by the discrepancy between the testimony of these witnesses and the details given in the statement of further particulars filed by the petitioner on 26th August, 1971. There it was clearly stated that among those who addressed the meeting held in Iglas at 8 P.M. on 7th March, 1971, was Chaudhari Charan Singh; but none of the four witnesses deposes to Chaudhary Charan Singh's participation in the meeting and from the statement of Brij Lal Sharma it is clear that Chaudhary Charan Singh did not attend it.

Two of the persons who are alleged to have spoken at this Iglas meeting have come forward on behalf of the respondent to deny having done so. These are Ramesh Chand (R.W. 10) and Virendra Varma (R.W. 7). Learned counsel for the petitioner has laid great stress on the fact that the third speaker Yogendra Pal Singh has not been examined in rebuttal. But it was not necessary to examine each and every person who was alleged to have made a speech. It was quite sufficient to my mind to examine one of the principal speakers viz. Virendra Varma; and in the circumstances of this case I am certainly not prepared to draw any adverse inference against the respondent for not producing Yogendra Pal Singh as well.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further tried to make capital out of the admission of Virendra Varma (R.W. 7) that he visited a school in Iglas, which may have been the Jawahar Inter College, on 7th March, 1971. But Virendra Varma has explained that when he went to Iglas and other places in the constituency

on 7th March, 1971, and 8th March, 1971, it was merely in order to meet the B.K.D. workers of those places and not to hold any public meeting or to make any electioneering speeches. Indeed it is difficult to believe that anyone holding the post of Home Minister of the State would have deliberately infringed the provisions of section 126 of the Representation of the People Act by holding a public meeting at that time. And as a matter of fact the frankness of this witness in admitting his visit to Iglas goes a long way towards establishing his bona fides and veracity, for this was a fact that might easily have been denied, when there was no documentary record of the visit. In the circumstances I am inclined to believe Virendra Varma when he says that on the occasion in question he merely spoke to B.K.D. workers and did not address any public meeting. His statement on this point finds corroboration in the testimony of Virendra Singh (R.W.9), the Secretary of the Iglas Tahsil B.K.D.

Weighing up the evidence produced by both parties regarding the alleged speeches at Iglas on 7th March 1971, I find that the petitioner's allegations in this connexion remain completely unsubstantiated. His witnesses are definitely unreliable and unconvincing and their testimony stands fully rebutted by the evidence produced by the respondent in reply.

The next meeting to be considered is that which is alleged to have been held in Gabhana on 8th March, 1971. Four witnesses have been produced by the petitioner to depose to this, but none of them inspires confidence. Raj Kumar Singh (P.W. 24), who lives in a village 4 miles from Gabhana, would have us believe that Shiv Kumar Shastri and Prakash Vir Shastri came specially to pick him up and take him to Gabhana in their Jeep, so that he could attend the meeting. He tries to explain this conduct on their part by suggesting that he is related to Shiv Kumar Shastri, but the relationship is so remote as to be practically non-existent. Om Bir Singh (P.W. 25) has come to give evidence on being asked to do so by one Farooq, who was one of Yunus Saleem's workers in the election. Chaitanvan Raj Singh (P.W. 26), a former M.L.A., was admittedly by an active supporter of Yunus Saleem in this election; and he admits that he knew that no meeting could be legally held on 8th March, 1971, yet he made no report to the election authorities or to the police about the meeting which he claims to have attended in Gabhana that day. Deo Datt Bharadwaj (P.W. 29) is a chance witness who claims that he happened to be passing through Gabhana at the time when the meeting was being held; and he is moreover a member of the Communist Party which had an 'adjustment' with the Congress (R) for fighting the elections in U.P. None of these witnesses can be considered independent or reliable; and their testimony stands effectively rebutted by the respondent Shiv Kumar Shastri (R.W. 14), who denies having gone to Gabhana at all on the date in question, as well as by two residents of Gabhana, the Sarpanch Jodh Pal Singh (P.W. 11) and a shopkeeper Reghunath Prasad Sharma (P.W. 12), who deny that any B.K.D. meeting was held there on that date.

We are now left with the meeting alleged to have been held in Beswa on 8th March, 1971, deposed to by Radha Ramon Dhwaí Prasad Singh and Har Charan Lal (P.Ws. 21 and 22). The former I have already held to be unreliable while discussing issue No. 5; while the latter proved to be very vague when questioned about other election meetings that he had attended. This Har Charan Lal has tried to make out that he was supporting Shiv Kumar Shastri in the election, though he has now come forward to give evidence against him; and he would have us believe that he came to Allahabad to give evidence just because P.W. 21 sent him, without being given any indication as to why he was being sent. Rebuttal for this evidence, though hardly necessary, is provided by the testimony

of Virendra Varma (R.W. 7), who denies making any speech at Beswa, and by the statement of Virendra Singh (R.W. 9), the B.K.D. Secretary of Iglas Tahsil.

As in the case of the Iglas meeting, so too in the case of this Beswa meeting, learned counsel for the petitioner has laid stress on the admission of Virendra Varma that he visited the village in question on the date when the meeting is said to have been held. But here too we have Virendra Varma's assertion that he had gone there merely to meet the B.K.D. workers and did not address any public meeting; and I accept this statement as true for the reasons already given when discussing the Iglas meeting. The failure of the respondent to examine Yogendra Pal Singh has also been commented upon in relation to the Beswa meeting; but since one of the persons alleged to be the principal speakers, viz. Virendra Varma, has been examined, I see no necessity for examining Yogendra Pal Singh as well and am not prepared to draw any adverse inference from his non-production.

The result is that none of the charge based on the speeches said to have been made at the meeting at Jatari, Gordha, Iglas, Gabhana and Beswa has been established. Issues 8, 8-A, 9, 10 and 11 are accordingly decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 12.

In view of the decisions given in the preceding issues, no corrupt practice, as defined in clause (1), (2), (3), (3-A) and (4) of section 123 of the Representation of the People Act, has been proved to have been committed by respondent No. 1. This issue is accordingly decided against the petitioner.

Issue No. 13.

The petition must fail, in view of the findings given on the other issues, and the petitioner is entitled to no relief.

ORDER

The petition is accordingly dismissed. The respondents Shiv Shastri, pooran Singh Malan and the Chief Election Commissioner will be entitled to recover their costs, estimated at Rs. 600/-, Rs. 100/- and Rs. 100/- respectively.

Sd./- W. B.

Dated 21st December, 1971.

[No. 82/6 of 1971/UP/72.]

New Delhi, the 14th February 1972

S.O. 849.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-section (2) of section 116C of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Election Commission hereby publishes the judgement dated the 2nd February, 1972 of the Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 909(NCE) of 1971 against the judgement of the High Court of judicature at Patna in Election Petition No. 2 of 1970.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL No. 909 OF 1971

N. E. Horo

Appellant.

Vs

Smt. Jahan Ara Jaipal Singh

Respondent.

JUDGMENT

GROVER, J.

This is an appeal from a judgment of the Patna High Court holding that the nomination papers of the respondent Smt. Jahan Ara Jaipal Singh had been illegally rejected by the Returning Officer. For that reason the election of the returned candidate Shri N. E. Horo from the 51 Khuntl Parliamentary (Scheduled Tribe) Constituency in the State of Bihar was set aside.

On May 1, 1970 the Election Commission of India issued a notification calling upon the above-named Parliamentary Constituency to elect a Member to the Lok Sabha in the vacancy caused by the death of late Shri Jaipal Singh. The last date for filing the nomination papers was May 8, 1970. The date for scrutiny was May 9, 1970. Several persons filed nomination papers including Theodore Bodra and others. Two nomination papers were filed on behalf of the respondent who was a Congress (Ruling) candidate for the aforesaid by-election. According to the respondent she was the widow of late Shri Jaipal Singh and was a member of the Munda Scheduled Tribe in the State of Bihar. She filed certain certificates to that effect. Bodra filed an objection petition to the nomination papers of the respondent. The Returning Officer, after hearing arguments, passed an order rejecting the nomination papers of the respondent. The nomination papers of all the other candidates were accepted. After the polling took place the result of the election was announced on June 3, 1970 and the appellant Shri Horo was declared elected to the Lok Sabha. On July 8, 1970 the respondent filed an election petition.

In the election petition it was stated *inter alia* that the petitioner (who is now respondent before us) was the widow of late Shri Jaipal Singh and belonged to the Munda Scheduled Tribe although she was a Christian by religion. It was averred in paragraph 3 of the petition that according to the Munda Customary Law when a Munda male married outside the Munda Tribe if his marriage is accepted by the Tribe he continues to be a member of that Tribe and his wife also acquires its membership. It was pleaded that the wife being a member of her husband's family had the right of succession to her husband's property as well. In para 4 of the petition it was stated that the petitioner was a Tamil by birth. She married late Shri Jaipal Singh in the year 1954 according to the rights and rituals of Mundas in the presence of Parha Raja, Parha Munda, Parha Pahan, relatives of the deceased and the members of the Tribe at Morabadi a Mohalla of Ranchi. In paragraph 5 the ceremonies which were performed according to Munda custom were mentioned. These ceremonies *inter alia* were the washing of the wife's feet by the elder sister of the husband and the holding of the feast of the male goat meat and drinks of Handia etc. A new name was given by her mother-in-law to the petitioner, that name being Lankashri. All these functions were witnessed by Parha Raja, Parha Munda, Parha Pahan and other members of the Tribe. In paragraph 6 more details were given of the various other ceremonies also which were performed in connection with the marriage. After referring to the relevant provisions of the Representation of People Act 1951, hereinafter called the 'Act', it was stated that the Returning Officer had illegally allowed irrelevant personal aspersions to be cast against the petitioner by her opponents. It was alleged that the Returning Officer had been influenced by Bodra who was the Chairman of the Bihar Legislative Council. The decision of the Returning Officer that the status of a Munda could be acquired only by birth and not by marriage and that the petitioner did not belong to the Munda Scheduled Tribe was challenged principally on the ground that the Returning Officer had not considered the custom by which if a Munda male marries a woman not belonging to Munda Tribe and that is accepted by the Tribe the wife acquires the membership thereof.

In his written statement the returned candidate Shri Horo maintained that even though the election petitioner might be living as wife of late Shri Jaipal Singh she was never married in accordance with the custom of the Munda Tribe prevalent in Chhota Nagpur. It was denied that she was ever accepted as a member of the Munda community as no such custom is prevalent in that community. It was denied that the ceremonies and rituals mentioned in the election petition had been performed in respect of the marriage of the election petitioner with the late Shri Jaipal Singh.

In paragraph 25 of the written statement it was asserted that a non-Munda merely by virtue of the marriage with a Munda could not *ipso facto* become a Munda. If a person was not born of a father belonging to a Scheduled Tribe he or she could not legally claim to be a member of the said Tribe. It was asserted that since the election petitioner was not the daughter of a member of the Munda Tribe she could not claim to be a member of that Scheduled Tribe. The allegations of mala fides made against the Returning Officer were described as baseless and extraneous.

During the pendency of the election petition the Lok Sabha was dissolved on December 27, 1970. A petition was filed before the High Court on behalf of Shri Horo that the election petition should be dismissed as having become infructuous. The court made an order on January 14, 1971 holding that the election petition could not be dismissed on that ground.

On the pleadings of the parties seven issues were framed. Issues 1, 2 and 3 which are material need be mentioned.

(1) Is the election petition maintainable?

(2) Whether the petitioner was the legally married wife of late Shri Jaipal Singh according to the custom of Munda Tribe prevalent in Chhota Nagpur?

(3) Whether the petitioner could legally acquire the status of a Munda by virtue of her marriage to late Shri Jaipal Singh and whether she had been accepted as a member of the Munda Tribe by the said Tribe?

It may be mentioned that so far as issue No. 1 was concerned the objection taken was that the election petition was defective on account of the non-joinder of necessary parties. When the election petition was filed only Shri Horo the returned candidate was impleaded but subsequently a petition was filed on behalf of the election petitioner making a prayer that the other contesting candidates were also necessary parties and should be impleaded. The court directed that they be added as parties. Shri Bodra who was one of the contesting parties was consequently impleaded as a party. Later on it was prayed on behalf of the petitioner that on a further consideration it was found that the persons who had been subsequently added were not necessary parties and their names might be deleted. Bodra's name was therefore deleted. The argument raised before the High Court was that Bodra being a necessary party to the petition under clause (b) of section 82 of the Act the petition became defective as soon as his name was struck off at the instance of the election petitioner. The High Court was of the view that although in paragraph 21 of the election petition an allegation had been made that Bodra had influenced the Returning Officer no evidence was led on that point and the case of the election petitioner was based solely on the ground that the nomination paper had been illegally and improperly rejected. No relief had been sought on the ground that undue influence had been exercised on the Returning Officer by Bodra. The High Court was also of the view that the allegation made in the election petition that Bodra had exercised his influence in getting the nomination paper of the election petitioner rejected did not fall within the ambit and scope of sub-section (7) of section 123 of the Act. The contention that the petition was not maintainable was consequently rejected.

On the main issues, namely (2) and (3) it was expressly stated in the judgment that the factum of the marriage of the election petitioner with the late Shri Jaipal Singh had not been disputed. The real controversy between the parties in the High Court centered round the point whether the marriage was in such form that the wife acquired the membership of the Tribe. According to the arguments on behalf of Shri Horo as the election petitioner was not a Munda she could not belong to the Munda Tribe and that by marriage such a status could never be acquired. The

High Court examined the evidence relating to the question whether the marriage of the election petitioner with late Shri Jaipal Singh had been performed in accordance with the Munda custom and was in such form that she was accepted and treated as a member of the Munda Tribe. The court also considered the various authoritative books and other works relating to the Mundas and came to the conclusion that on a survey of the entire evidence and the circumstances there was no reason to discredit the evidence which had been led on behalf of the petitioner that she was married according to the Munda custom and that it was with the approval and sanction of the Tribe that she had been accepted as a member of the Munda tribe.

The first contention raised by Mr. Frank Anthony on behalf of the appellant relates to issue No. 1. It has been maintained by him that Bodra was a necessary Party. Apart from the fact that he was the only person who had filed a written objection to the nomination of the respondent the election petition filed by the respondent contained serious allegations of corrupt practice against Bodra. As he had been given up as a party although impleaded at one stage the petition became defective and was not maintainable. According to clause (b) of section 82 of the Act the petitioner must join as a respondent any candidate against whom allegations of any corrupt practices are made in the petition. Section 86(1) provides that the High Court shall dismiss an election petition which does not comply *inter alia* with the provisions of section 81.

There can be little doubt that if the allegations made in the election petition against Bodra amounted to the commission of a corrupt practice by him it was obligatory on the part of the election petitioner to join him as a respondent to the petition. It is equally clear that in that event the petition would have become liable to dismissal. For finding out what a corrupt practice is we have to turn to section 123 of the Act. According to Mr. Anthony the allegations made against Bodra fell within sub-section (7) of section 123 which is in the following terms:

S. 123" The following shall be deemed to be corrupt practices for the purposes of this Act :—

- (7) The obtaining or procuring or abetting or attempting to obtain or procure by a candidate or his agent or, by any other person with the consent of a candidate or his election agent, any assistance other than the giving of vote for the furtherance of the prospects of that candidate's election, from any person in the service of the Government and belonging to any of the following classes, namely :—
 - (a) gazetted officers;
 - (b) stipendiary judges and magistrates;
 - (c) members of the armed forces of the Union;
 - (d) members of the police forces;
 - (e) excise officers;
 - (f) revenue officers other than village revenue officers known as *lambardars*, *malguzars*, *patels*, *deshmykhs* or by any other name, whose duty is to collect land revenue and who are remunerated by a share of, or commission on, the amount of land revenue collected by them but who do not discharge any police functions and
 - (g) such other class of persons in the service of the Government as may be prescribed.

Explanation.—(1) In this section the expression "agent" includes an election agent, a polling agent and any person who is held to have acted as an agent in connection with the election with the consent of the candidate.

(2) For the purposes of clause (7) a person shall be deemed to assist in the furtherance of the prospects of a candidate's election if he acts as an election agent of that candidate".

The allegations against Bodra are contained in para 21 of the election petition which may be set out :

"That the Returning Officer, while hearing the objections illegally allowed irrelevant personal aspersions to be cast against the petitioner by her opponents and the aforesaid Shree Theodore Bodra even after protests made by and on behalf of the petitioner, Shrimati Jahanara Jaipal Singh, against the same".

A plain reading of the above paragraph shows that no such allegation was made that Bodra had influenced the Returning Officer for the purpose mentioned in section 123(7) of the Act. The essential ingredient of that provision is to obtain, procure etc. by a candidate of any assistance (other than the giving of a vote) for the furtherance of the prospects of that candidate's election from any person in service of the Government and belonging to the classes mentioned in the sub-section. There is absolutely no allegation or suggestion in para 21 that the Returning Officer was influenced by Bodra for the purpose of rendering assistance for the furtherance of the prospects of the election of Smt. Jahanara Jaipal Singh. All that has been stated in that paragraph is that while hearing the objection the Returning Officer allowed irrelevant personal aspersions to be cast against the election petitioner by her opponents and Bodra. It was further stated that on inquiry the election petitioner came to learn that the Returning Officer had been influenced by Bodra. This influence apparently can have reference only to the conduct or act of the Returning Officer, in allowing personal aspersions to be cast against the election petitioner. Even by stretching the language it is not possible to discover any of the ingredients which would constitute a corrupt practice under section 123(7) of the Act. Faced with this situation Mr. Anthony sought to rely on sub-section (2) of section 123 the relevant part of which is as follows—

"(2) Undue influence, that is to say, any direct or indirect interference or attempt to interfere on the part of the candidate or his agent, or of any other person with the consent of the candidate or his election agent with the free exercise of any electoral right :

Provided that—"....."

It is not possible to comprehend how the allegation contained in para 21 can be understood to amount to a suggestion of direct or indirect interference or attempt to interfere on the part of the candidate etc. with the free exercise of any electoral right. We are accordingly satisfied that no allegation of any corrupt practice had been made in the election petition against Bodra and therefore he was not a necessary party within section 82 of the Act. In this view of the matter it is not necessary to examine the criticism of Mr. Anthony of that part of the judgment of the High Court according to which one of the reasons given for deciding issue No. 1 in favour of the present respondent was that no relief had been sought on the ground that undue influence had been exercised on the Returning Officer by Bodra and that no evidence was led on that point.

On issues 2 and 3 Mr. Anthony has raised three main points. The first was that the respondent who was a Christian by birth was a divorcee and according to her own statement the decree nisi in the divorce proceedings had been made absolute on May 6, 1954. According to her she got married to late Shri Jaipal Singh on May 7, 1954. This marriage was a nullity as under section 57 of the Indian Divorce Act 1869 she could not enter into a second marriage until after the expiry of six months from the date the decree had been made absolute. Secondly the High Court had

palpably erred in holding that the respondent had become a member of the Munda tribe by marrying Shri Jaipal Singh and set aside the order of the Returning Officer who had held that she was a Christian by birth and Munda tribe being an ethnic group its membership could not be acquired by marriage but could be acquired only by birth. Thirdly it has been strongly urged that the respondent failed to prove the custom that a non-Munda could be initiated into the tribe as its full fledged member either by performance of certain rituals and ceremonies or by the acceptance as such by the tribe or its panchayat.

As regards the first point it was never canvassed or argued before the High Court. No plea was taken by Shri Horo in the written statement that there could be no valid marriage between the respondent and late Shri Jaipal Singh owing to the provisions contained in section 57 of the Indian Divorce Act 1869 until after the lapse of a period of six months from the date the decree of divorce was made absolute. None of the issues which was framed by the High Court involve the question now sought to be agitated based on the provisions of section 57 of the Indian Divorce Act. It appears that advantage is sought to be taken from the statement of the respondent about the various dates when the decree absolute was granted and the date when the marriage took place between the respondent and late Shri Jaipal Singh. In the absence of any pleadings or issues no material has been placed on the record to show that in view of the provisions of section 57 of the aforesaid Act there could not be a valid marriage according to the Munda customary law. It must be remembered that the respondent contracted a marriage with late Shri Jaipal Singh according to Munda rights and ceremonies and not as one Christian marrying another Christian. Nor was the matter pursued in cross-examination of the respondent and she was not asked as to how she could get over the bar of section 57 in the way of re-marriage before the expiry of the prescribed period. In these circumstances we do not consider that such a point can be allowed to be agitated for the first time before this court.

On the second and the third points a great deal of reliance has been placed on the following statement in the well known book of S. C. Roy "Mundas and their country", 1912 Edn. :-

"The Munda tribe is divided into a large number of exogamous groups called kills. According to Munda tradition, all the members of the same Kili are descended from one common ancestor. But such a tradition may not be quite correct with regard to the original kills. Though exogamous as regards the kills, the Mundas are endogamous so far as other tribes are concerned. Thus, there can now be no valid marriage, according to Munda custom, between a Munda and the member of any other 'kolarian' tribe, such as the Santals, the Kharias, the Asurs, or the Bir-hors"

According to Roy the family came to be evolved from tribes and sub-tribes. Communal marriage was superseded by the individual marriage and Patriarchal Age was superseded by Patriarchal. Kinship came to be traced not as before, though a common female ancestor but through a male ancestor. D. N. Mazumdar in his work on the Ho tribe entitled "Affairs of a Tribe", 1950 Edn. points out that the rule of endogamy has its base in superstitious belief. According to him villages which are closely allied by ties of marriage are those which share the same God and Spirits and the same Deonwa. The influence of Deonwas, in other words, the knowledge of the Bongas of an area, determines the limit of exogamy, for there is a risk in marrying in villages the Bongas of which are unknown; (pp. 237-238). From the account given by S. C. Roy himself it appears that according to the Munda custom the rule of endogamy is not absolute;

for instance, in the case of Munda female married or unmarried found to have gone astray with a man of a different caste or tribe, it is said, that the latter is summoned before a Panchayat and a heavy fine is imposed on the lover and the fine, if realised, is paid as compensation to the parents of the seduced maiden or the husband of the married female and the seducer is compelled to take the girl or women as wife or a mistress and in case of refusal (which is rare) to submit to the orders of the Panchayat. The family of the seduced female remains outcaste until a purificatory ceremony is performed and thus restored to caste. The members of the family then cook rice and pulse and themselves distribute the food to the assembled relatives: (see pp. 544-545.)

The question that has to be enquired into is whether the strict rule of endogamy of the Munda tribe has been deviated from and whether custom has sanctioned such deviation. D. N. Mazumdar in his work "Races and Cultures of India" deals with tribal organisations in Chapter 17. According to him the definition that is found in the current literature on the subject is given in the Imperial Gazetteer which is, "A tribe is a collection of families bearing a common name, speaking a common dialect occupying or professing to occupy a common territory and is not usually endogamous though originally it might have been so". Endogamy is an essential feature of the tribe though inter-tribal marriages are breaking the limits of endogamy. It is further stated by him that "the importance of the blood bond or the kinship group is forced to the background, the communal economy of the clan is superseded by the individual desire for gain and property, money assumes an importance it seldom had before, and the ties of reciprocity and mutuality of obligation are reoriented to suit new conditions. Tribal custom and practices which established social life lose their value and the choice of leader and of mate is guided by different considerations". The Munda tribe cannot be said to be immune from the above process of change in their social organisation. Changes in their belief, customs, traditions and practices have taken place under the influence of Hinduism, Christianity, and on account of the impact of western education, urbanisation, industrialisation and improved means of communication. The sense of individualism and lack of love for the traditional code of conduct and social taboos are stated to be apparent among the emerging urban-industrial oriented adivasi communities.

D. N. Mazumdar has made an intensive study of the rule of endogamy among the Ho tribe which is an off-shoot of the Munda tribe. A reference to the Ho practice may, therefore, help us in understanding the practice among the Mundas. According to D. N. Mazumdar "A Ho does not marry outside the tribe as a rule but there is today no legal or social prohibition against his doing so. Though tribal code has relaxed considerably those who work in the mining and industrial centres in and outside Kolhan contract such alliances and when they come back to their villages they are not outcasted by the society: (pp. 124-125, "Races and cultures of India"). At another place he records:—

"The endogamy of the tribe is not sacred today, with the result that many marriages have taken place between the Hos and other tribes. Liaison between Diku men and Ho girls is increasing, and cases that have occurred in Chaibassa during the last ten years or so would fill a volume. Thus, there being no longer any deterrent to mating with strangers, social authority vested in the *Killi punch* has to exercise its prerogative to ensure a compliance with social traditions. *Killi* exogamy has not led to an indiscriminate alliance between the different kills and as far as our knowledge goes, taboo on marriage outside a particular local area can be traced to a

dread of unfamiliar Bongas who were conceived as hostile, and therefore dangerous". (p. 236).

L. P. Vidyarthi in his work mentioned before based on his study of the social life of the Oraon and Munda tribes living in the city of Ranchi points out that a good number of cases of marriage between tribals and non-tribals have occurred and that in his investigation he came across 53 cases of non-tribal males marrying tribal girls. He points out that greater percentage of love marriages and marriages by 'Kept' have been socially disapproved while 83.3 per cent and 100 per cent of arranged and legal (civil) marriages have been approved. (See pages 102-103).

We may now deal with the evidence produced by the parties on the above points. P.W. 1 who was working as District Welfare Officer in May 1970 at Ranchi and who belongs to the Munda tribe stated that if a Munda male married a non-Munda girl and such marriage was accepted by the society it would be a valid and proper marriage. The wife would, therefore, be accepted as a member of the tribe. He had himself married an Oraon girl and his wife though a non-Munda had been accepted as a member of the Munda tribe. He further deposed that if the Munda married a non-Munda a feast is given and if the elders of the society accept the marriage and participate in the feast that by itself would show that the tribal society has accepted the marriage and the wife has become a member of the tribe. P.W. 2 who is a nephew of the late Shri Jaipal Singh gave details of the ceremonies which were performed when marriage between his uncle and the respondent took place. After the performance of those ceremonies the members of the tribe and the family declared that the respondent had been accepted as a member of the tribe. He himself is married to a non-Munda girl though he was married according to Munda marriages rights as well as according to Hindu law. P.W. 3 who was at the material time working as Assistant Director in Sociology, Bihar Tribal Welfare Institute, stated that he had been doing research on the subject of Bihar Tribal Marriage and Family Transformation with special reference to Family law. One of his major duties was to ascertain the members of different tribes and facts relating to the subject of his research. According to his evidence a Munda male can marry a non-Munda girl. After adopting a special procedure in some cases a non-Munda wife is accepted as a member of the tribe. A certain procedure or formality has to be gone through. The Council of elders of the tribal people has to be consulted and the special reason for the marriage is to be stated. Then various rituals are gone through and the marriage is allowed by the elders. He gave instances where a Munda male had married a non-Munda girl and their marriage had been accepted by the tribal people. One of these instances given by him related to persons belonging to the Santhals and Ho tribes. He maintained that the customs prevalent among these tribes were broadly the same as among the Mundas. In cross-examination he stated that he had met the members of the Munda elder council and he had remained in touch with that council since 1952. He had made special research of Jojo Hatu which was a Munda village. He claimed to have submitted a report to the government in which he had collected hundreds of cases where a girl of a particular tribe had married outside her tribe. P.W. 4, was the Superintendent of the Anthropological Survey of India, Ministry of Education. As an Anthropologist he had to undertake full study in different parts of India mostly among the tribal community. He had studied Munda tribal customs which assignment had been given to him in 1965-66. In course of the research he found that a Munda could marry a non-Munda girl even before 1954. He gave three kinds of unusual marriages one of which was where a Munda male married a non-Munda female. The social consequences of that marriage was called *Juti Bora*. That meant that the Munda male

had committed an offence against the whole community. Normally he would be ostracised along with his family but there was a process by which he and his wife could be admitted into the community. This process was known 'Niyar' which means "to bring in or take in". The offending party invites the members of the Parha gives them a feast at which a white goat is sacrificed and the blood is smeared on the body of the boy and the girl along with *Iarmoluk* and then they are allowed to sit along with the members of the community in the same *Pankti*. After that they are formally considered as members of the community. He was specifically asked a question with regard to the manner in which a Munda boy marrying a non-Munda girl would be accepted by the community and his reply was that in his opinion the *parha* was the ultimate authority in the matter of acceptance of a non-Munda girl in the community. If a *Parha* accepted her that was final. In cross-examination he stated that if a marriage of the nature under discussion is not approved by *Parha* he did not think it would be accepted by the members of the society. It may be mentioned that the evidence of this witness has been subjected to a good deal criticism by Mr. Anthony for the reason that he was only expressing an opinion on the last matter and was not making a definite statement of fact. P.W. 5, who was attached to the office of Deputy Commissioner, Palamau, gave an account of the ceremonies which were performed of the marriage between the respondent and late Shri Jaipal Singh. According to him the elders of the community unanimously decided that since permission had been given by the elders they would be taken as members of the tribe. He denied the suggestion that it was on account of the influence of late Shri Jaipal Singh that Pahans had given sanction to the marriage. According to him there had been other cases also where such sanction had been given.

P.W. 8 who claimed to be a *Parha Raja* of three Parhas, viz., Takara Parha, Sada Parha and Sagha Parha comprising 36 villages also gave evidence about the ceremonies which were performed at the marriage of late Shri Jaipal Singh with the respondent. After the performance of the ceremonies the Samaj of the Munda tribe accepted the marriage, according to him. He deposed to other instances where Munda had married non-Mundas. He had attended a marriage of a Munda who had married a Ho girl. Sanction was given by the elders to that marriage. It is unnecessary to refer to the evidence of P.W. 10 who is also a Pahan and who claimed to have been present at the time of the marriage in question. He made a statement which has been subjected to justifiable criticism by Mr. Anthony about the document Exht-3. His evidence, therefore, does not deserve consideration. Out of the witnesses examined on behalf of the respondent mention may be made of the statement of Shri Horo himself who appeared as P.W. 6. After stating that the late Shri Jaipal Singh who was a leader of the Jharkhand Party and was an Adivasi and a Munda professing the Christian religion, he affirmed that the respondent did not have the right and status of a Munda on the basis of established custom. He admitted that there was a custom that a Munda who had been ex-communicated from the tribe could be taken back but according to him that person must be a Munda and no non-Munda could be accepted as a member of the tribe. The Munda could of course marry a non-Munda but in the manner in which the Munda usually married a Munda. The custom among the Mundas is changing and it is dynamic and not static.

According to the observations of the High Court Shri Horo did not examine any witness on his behalf who could say that he had made a special study and research of the marriage custom of the Munda tribe and that such a marriage was not acceptable in the present times in spite of all the changes which have taken place in the life and social structure of the community owing to the impact of the various factors

which have been mentioned in the authoritative studies of eminent Anthropologists mentioned before.

Our attention has been drawn by Mr. Anthony to certain decisions for the proposition that in a tribe which is endogamous birth alone can confer the status of membership of the tribal community. In *V. V. Giri v. D. Suri Dora and Others* one of the questions raised was whether respondent No. 1 in that case had ceased to be a member of the Scheduled Tribe at the material time because he had become a Kshatriya. This court observed that it was essential to bear in mind the broad and recognised features of the hierarchical social structure prevalent amongst the Hindus. It was considered enough to state that whatever might have been the origin of the Hindu castes and tribes in ancient times, gradually status came to be based on birth alone. It was pointed out that a person who belonged by birth to a depressed caste or tribe would find it very difficult, if not impossible, to attain the status of a higher caste amongst the Hindus by virtue of his volition, education, culture and status. We are unable to see how this case can be of any assistance in deciding the matter before us, namely, whether a non-Munda can by marriage be recognised as a member of the Munda tribe in certain circumstances.

The High Court, after discussing the evidence and referring to other authoritative books like "Tribes and Castes of Bengal" by H. H. Risley and "Encyclopaedia Mundarica" by Rev. John Hoffman as also the statement in Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 15, and the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics by James Hastings, Vol. IX apart from the work of J. Reid, I.C.S., on Chhota Nagpur Tenancy Act, observed that although originally very severe restrictions were imposed amongst the Mundas as far as marriage in their own Kili or sect was concerned. The process of Munda assimilation to the larger Indian society facilitated by improved communications and the introduction of formal system of education was being accelerated under the independent Government of India. In Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 15 in the Chapter relating to Mundas it is also mentioned. "The Munda speaking people, with the other Indian tribal groups, are being encouraged to adopt new customs and to become fully participating members of Indian society". (page 991). Similarly in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics by James Hastings, Vol. IX, it has been stated as to how Munda customs are being changed with the impact of the influence of Christianity. Referring to the Chapter in Reid's book it has been noticed by the High Court that according to the Munda conception a wife becomes a member of the Kili of her husband by legal fiction. The High Court further relied on the decision in *Wilson Read v. C. S. Booth* in which it was held that the question whether a person can be regarded as a member of the Khasi tribe was a question of fact depending upon the evidence produced in the case. It was held that the whole object of reserving a seat for a particular tribe was to afford the community, as a whole, a right of representation and therefore the question of the membership of a particular individual of that community could not be considered divorced from the very object of legislation. Thus the conduct of the community which had been given the right of special representation, the manner and how the community regarded a particular individual and whether the community as a whole intended to take the individual within its fold were all matters which would be relevant for consideration of the question whether a particular person could be regarded as a member of the Scheduled Tribe. The High Court was alive to the fact and this point of distinction has been greatly emphasised by Mr. Anthony that in that case the appellant claimed to be a Khasi, his father being a European and his mother a member of the Khasi tribe. Even though the facts were different, the approach in such matters

which commended itself to the Assam High Court can hardly be regarded as unsound.

It appears to us, on a full consideration of the entire material, that the following matters stand established in the present case:—

- (1) The Mundas are endogenous and inter-marriage with non-Mundas is normally prohibited.
- (2) That a Munda male along with his family on marrying a non-Munda girl is often ex-communicated or outcasted.
- (3) That the rule of endogamy is not so rigid that a Munda cannot marry a non-Munda after performing special ceremonies.
- (4) That such marriages have been and are being sanctioned by the Parha Panchayat.
- (5) That where a Munda male and his family are outcasted for marrying a non-Munda they are admitted to the tribe after certain special ceremonies are performed.

Even in the account given by S. C. Roy as well as by P.W. 4 a Munda male is ex-communicated for marrying a non-Munda girl but such ex-communication is not automatic. It is left to the discretion of the panchayat. If the panchayat approved of a particular marriage with a non-Munda then no question of ex-communication arises. Thus several inroads appear to have been made on the rigid system of endogamy which might have existed at one time but over the course of years several matters are left to be decided by the panchayat or elders of the tribe itself. There is no evidence whatsoever that the late Shri Jaipal Singh was ex-communicated or outcasted because he had married a non-Munda. On the contrary there is abundant evidence that his marriage was accepted as valid and was approved by the Parha or the elders of the tribe.

Reverting to the argument that a non-Munda woman cannot become a member of the Munda tribe by marriage even if the marriage be valid because the Mundas are a patriarchal society and constitute an ethnic group, we have already referred to the evidence of the witnesses produced by the respondent who had made special research in the matter and even if we exclude the opinion of P.W. 4 who was Superintendent of Anthropological Survey of India that the Parha was the final authority in the matter of acceptance of a non-Munda girl in the community but the rest of his evidence cannot be brushed aside. From all this evidence it is proved that once the marriage of a Munda male with a non-Munda female is approved or sanctioned by the Parha panchayat they become members of the community. The contention of Mr. Anthony that a person can be Munda by birth alone can be sustained only if the custom of endogamy is established without any exception. We have already held that the rule of endogamy has not been proved to exist in the rigid or strict form canvassed by Mr. Anthony. That rule has not been strictly followed and the marriage of a Munda male with a non-Munda woman has been and is being approved and sanctioned by the Parha panchayat. If a non-Munda woman's marriage with a Munda male is valid it is difficult to say that she will not become a member of the Munda tribe. The concept of a tribe is bound to undergo changes, when numerous social, economic, educational and other like factors in a progressive country start having their impact. It is noteworthy that a Hinduised Munda and a Munda converted to Christianity can inter-marry and conversion to Christianity has not become an obstacle in the way of such marriage among the Mundas. Mr. Horo himself in all fairness affirmed that custom among the Mundas was not static but was dynamic and was changing. We do not find cogent or weighty reasons

for disagreeing with the view of the High Court on the points under discussion.

We may also refer to Article 330 of the Constitution according to which the seats reserved for the Scheduled Tribes are to be reserved in the House of the People, *inter alia*, for members of these Tribes. Under s. 33(2) of the Act a candidate for a reserved seat has to file a declaration specifying a particular caste or tribe of which he is a member. Article 342(1) empowers the President to specify the tribes or tribal communities or parts of or groups within tribes or tribal communities which shall, for the purposes of the Constitution, be deemed to be Scheduled Tribes in relation to the State or Union territory as the case may be. In Parts 1 to 12 of the Schedule to the Constitution (Scheduled Tribes) Order 1952 are specified the tribes or tribal communities or parts of or groups within the tribes or tribal communities who are to be deemed to be Scheduled tribes. Munda is one of such specified tribes or tribal communities. It can well be said that the term "tribal community" has a wider connotation than the expression "tribe". A person who, according to the strict custom of a tribe, cannot be regarded as a member of that tribe may well be regarded as a member of that tribal community. Where a non-Munda woman is married to a Munda male and the marriage is approved and sanctioned by the Parha Panchayat of that tribe and the marriage is valid she may not, on the assumption that the rule of endogamy prevails, become a member of the Munda tribe in the strict sense as not having been born in the tribe. She cannot, however, be excluded from the larger group, namely, the tribal community. The High Court has taken the view that the use of the term "tribal communities" in addition to the term "tribes" in Article

342 shows that a wide import and meaning should be given to these words and even if the respondent is not a member of the Munda tribe by virtue of birth she having been married to a Munda after due observance of all formalities and after obtaining the approval of the elders of the tribes would belong to the tribal community to which her husband belongs on the analogy of the wife taking the husband's domicile. Even without invoking the doctrine of domicile the respondent's marriage with late Shri Jaipal Singh who was a Munda having been approved and sanctioned by the Parha Panchayat of the Munda tribe it can well be said that she became a member of the Munda tribal community. We have not been shown any infirmity in the reasoning of the High Court on this point. When a person, in the course of time, has been assimilated in the community it is somewhat difficult to comprehend how that person can be denied the rights and privileges which may be conferred on that community even though tribal by constitutional provisions.

In the result this appeal fails and it is dismissed but in view of the nature of the points involved we leave the parties to bear their own costs in this court.

A. N. GROVER, J.

M. H. BEG, J.

February 2, 1972.

[No. 82/BR/2/70.]

By Order,

A. N. SEN, Secy.

CABINET SECRETARIAT

(Enforcement Directorate)

(Department of Personnel)

F.E.R.A.

New Delhi, the 21st November, 1970

S.O. 950.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 27 of the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, 1947 (VII of 1947) and in pursuance of the powers conferred under the Foreign Exchange Regulation (Publication of Names) Rules, 1970, the Director of Enforcement hereby publishes the names and other particulars of the persons who have been adjudged by the Director of Enforcement to have contravened the provisions specified in sub-section 1 of section 23 of the F.E.R. Act for the period 7th January, 1970 to 6th May, 1970 being the categories of persons provided in rule 3 of the said Rules.

S. No.	Name & address of the person	Date and No. of the order and particulars of the penalty imposed	Provisions of the Act contravened
1	2	3	4
1.	Mr. Joseph Mercer C/o Royal Western India Turf Club, Mahalaxmi, Bombay-7.	1/98/70 dated 21-3-70 Rs. 22,000/-	4(I)
2.	Shri K. M. Ibrahim, 205, Second Floor, Linghi Chetty Street, Madras-1.	IV/28/70 dated 25-2-70 Rs. 15,000/-	5(I)(aa) 5(I)(c)
3.	Shri V. Sornanathan, Chettiar, Amman Koilar Street, Devakottai, Ramnad Dist.	IV/40/70 dated 18-3-70 Rs. 15,000/-	5(I)(aa) 5(I)(c) 9

[No. F.E.D./Genl. (44)/70]

M. G. WAGH,
Director,

प्रवर्तन निदेशालय

(प्रवर्तन निदेशालय)

(कर्मिक विभाग)

वि० न० वि० अ०

नई दिल्ली, 21 नवम्बर 1970

११०२०३३०.— विदेशी मुद्रा विनिर्माण प्रक्रिया 1947 (1947 का सन) की धारा 27 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए प्रवर्तन निदेशालय (प्रवर्तन निदेश) दिनांक 1070 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों के अनुषंग में प्रवर्तन निदेशक इसके द्वारा उन व्यक्तियों के नाम और अन्य बारे प्रकाशित करते हैं कि प्रवर्तन निदेशक ने यह निर्णय दिया है कि उन व्यक्तियों ने 7 जनवरी, 1970 से 6 मई 1970 के लिये वि० न० वि० कर्मिक विभाग की धारा 23 के उप-धारा 1 के उपबन्धों का उल्लंघन किया है और वे उक्त नियमावली के नियम 3 में दिये गये व्यक्तियों की श्रेणी में आते हैं।

क्रम संख्या	व्यक्ति का नाम और पता	आदेश की तारीख और संख्या तथा अर्थ-दण्ड का व्यौरा	उपबन्ध जिनका उल्लंघन किया गया है
1	2	3	4
1	मिस्टर जोसेफ पैमन द्वारा—रायल वेस्टर्न इण्डिया टर्फ I/98/78 दिनांक 24-3-70 रु० 22,000 क्लब महालक्ष्मी बम्बई-7।		4(1)
2	श्री के० एस० इब्राहीम 205 दूसरा फ्लोर लकी चेट्टी स्ट्रीट मवराम-1	IV/28/70 दिनांक 25-2-70 रु० 15,000	5(1) (एए) 5(1) (सी)
3	श्री बी० मोर्ननाथ चेट्टियार, अम्मन कोइलार स्ट्रीट देवकोट्टई रामनद जिला।	IV/40/70 दिनांक 18-3-70 रु० 15,000	(5(1) (एए) 5(1) (सी) 9

[सं० का० प्रनि० /सा०(44)/70]

एम० जी० वाघ,
निदेशक,
प्रवर्तन निदेशालय।

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

(INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION)

New Delhi, the 1st February 1972

S.O. 851.—In partial modification of the then Ministry of Industrial Development and Company Affairs (Indian Standards Institution) notification No. S.O. 3456 dated 5 September 1968 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated 28 September 1968, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the marking fee per unit for distribution fuse-boards and cutouts has been revised. The revised rate of marking fee, details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, shall be into force with effect from 1 Jan. 1972:

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Product	No. and Title of Relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking fee per unit
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	Distribution fuse-boards and cutouts rewirable.	IS : 2675-1966 Specification for enclosed One fuse-distribution fuse-boards and cutouts for board voltages not exceeding 1000 volts.	One fuse-board	(i) 25 paise per unit for 6, 16, 25 and 32A current rating of types SP and SFN; (ii) 50 paise per unit for 6, 16, 25 and 32A current rating of types DP, TP and TPN;

1	2	3	4	5
				(iii) Re 1.00 per unit for 33 and 100 A current rating of types SP-, SPN, DP, TP and TPN.

[No. CMD/13:10]

M. V. PATANKAR,
Director (Central Marks)

औद्योगिक विज्ञान संस्थान

(भारतीय मानक संस्था)

नई दिल्ली, 1 फरवरी 1972

एच० ओ० 851.—भारत के राजपत्र भाग II खण्ड 3 उपखण्ड 2 दिनांक 28 सितम्बर 1968 में प्रकाशित तत्कालीन औद्योगिक विज्ञान तथा कम्पनी मापनों के पत्रानुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था की अधिसूचना संख्या एस० ओ० 3456 दिनांक 5 सितम्बर 1968 में प्रकाशित संशोधन के रूप में भारतीय मानक संस्था की ओर से अधिभूषित किया जाना है कि प्रति इकाई वितरण फ्यूज बोर्डों और कटआउट की मुहरांकन फीसों में वृद्धि प्रदान किया गया है। मुहरांकन फीसों की ये संशोधित दरें जिनके ब्यौरे संलग्न अनुसूची में दिये गये हैं 1 जनवरी 1972 से लागू हो जायेंगी।

अनुसूची

उत्पाद और उत्पाद का वर्ग	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक की पदसंख्या और शीर्षक	इकाई	प्रति इकाई मुहरांकन फीस
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
			(5)
1. द्वारा तार लग सकने योग्य वितरण फ्यूज बोर्ड और कटआउट	IS: 2675-1966 1000-वोल्ट से अधिक वोल्टता के लिये बन्द वितरण फ्यूज बोर्डों और कट आउटों की विनिर्दिष्ट।	एक फ्यूज बोर्ड	(1) 6, 16, 25 और 32 ए धारा रेटिंग के एस पी और एस पी एन टा पों के प्रति फ्यूज बोर्ड 25 पैसे। (2) 6, 16, 25 और 32 ए धारा रेटिंग के डी पी, टी पी और टी० १ एन टाइपों के प्रति फ्यूज बोर्ड 50 पैसे। (3) 33 और 100 ए धारा रेटिंग के एस पी, एस पी एन, डी पी, टी पी और टी पी एन टाइपों के प्रति फ्यूज बोर्ड रु० 1.00।

[सं० सी० एम० डी० / 13:10]

एम० वी० पाटनकर,
निदेशक (सेन्द्रेल मार्क)।

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE

RUBBER CONTROL

New Delhi, the 10th February 1972

S.O. 852.—Shri T. V. Joseph, Secretary, Rubber Board, Kottayam, Kerala State, was granted earned leave for 20 days with effect from 11th May, 1970 to 30th May, 1970 (both days inclusive).

2. In pursuance of sub-section (2) of Section 6A of 1947 (24 of 1947), Shri K. V. Chacko, Finance and Accounts Officer in the Rubber Board, Kottayam was appointed to officiate as Secretary, Rubber Board, in addition to his own duties, during the period of leave of Shri T. V. Joseph.

[No. F. 21(19) Plant(B)/67.]

विदेश व्यापार मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 10 फरवरी, 1972

रबड़ नियंत्रण

का० आ० 852—रबड़ बोर्ड, कोट्टायम, केरल राज्य के सचिव श्री टी० वी० जोसेफ को 11 मई, 1970 से 30 मई, 1970 (दोनों दिनों सहित) 20 दिनों की अर्जित छुट्टी प्रदान की गई थी।

2. रबड़ अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 24) की धारा 6A की उप-धारा (2) के अनुसरण में रबड़ बोर्ड, कोट्टायम में वित्त तथा लेखा अधिकारी श्री के० वी० चाको को श्री टी० वी० जोसेफ की छुट्टी की अवधि के दौरान उनके अपने कार्य के अतिरिक्त बोर्ड के सचिव के पद पर स्थानापन्न रूप में नियुक्त किया गया।

[सं० फा० 21(19) प्लांट-(बी)/67]

S.O. 853.—Shri T. V. Joseph, Secretary, Rubber Board, Kottayam, Kerala, was granted earned leave for 30 days with effect from 9th March, 1971, to 7th April, 1971 (both days inclusive) with permission to re-leave 6th, 7th and 8th March, 1971, and suffix 8th, 9th, 10th and 11th April, 1971, being holidays to his leave.

2. In pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 6A of the Rubber Act, 1947 (24 of 1947), Shri K. V. Chacko, Finance and Accounts Officer in the Rubber Board, Kottayam was appointed to officiate as Secretary, Rubber Board, in addition to his own duties, during the period of leave of Shri T. V. Joseph.

[No. F. 21(19) Plant(B)/67.]

N. N. MALHAN,

Dy. Director.

का० आ० 853—रबड़ बोर्ड, कोट्टायम, केरल में सचिव श्री टी० वी० जोसेफ को 6, 7 तथा 8 मार्च, 1971 के पूर्ववर्ती नों और 8, 9, 10 तथा 11 अप्रैल, 1971 के अनुवर्ती दिनों को, 1 कि अवकाश दिवस थे, अपनी छुट्टी के साथ जोड़ने की अनुमति साथ 9 मार्च, 1971 से 7 अप्रैल, 1971 तक (दोनों दिनों सहित) न की अर्जित छुट्टी प्रदान की गई थी।

2. रबड़ अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 24) की धारा 6A की उप-धारा (2) के अनुसरण में रबड़ बोर्ड, कोट्टायम में वित्त तथा लेखा अधिकारी श्री के० वी० चाको को श्री टी० वी०

जोसेफ की छुट्टी की अवधि के दौरान उनके अपने कार्य के अतिरिक्त रबड़ बोर्ड के सचिव के पद पर स्थानापन्न रूप में नियुक्त किया जाता है।

[सं० फा० 21(19) प्लांट (बी) 167]

एन० एन० मल्हन,
उप-निदेशक

New Delhi, the 22nd February 1972

S.O. 854.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), coir mattings should be subject to quality control and inspection prior to export;

And whereas the Central Government has formulated the proposals specified below for the said purpose and has forwarded the same to the Export Inspection Council, as required by sub-rule (2), of rule 1 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the said sub-rule, the Central Government hereby publishes the said proposals for the information of the public likely to be affected hereby.

2. Notice is hereby given that any person desiring to forward any objections or suggestions with respect to the said proposals may forward the same within thirty days of the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette to the Export Inspection Council, 'World Trade Centre', 14/1B, Ezra Street (7th floor), Calcutta-1.

Proposals

(1). To notify that coir matting shall be subject to quality control and inspection prior to export;

(2). To specify the type of inspection in accordance with the Draft Export of Coir Mattings (Inspection) Rules, 1972, set out in Annexure I to this notification, as the type of inspection which would be applied to such coir mattings prior to export;

(3) To recognise—

(a) the specifications for coir mattings as set out in Annexure II to this notification as the standard specifications for the coir mattings;

(b) in the absence of any specifications as set out in Annexure II, the specifications formulated by a panel of experts appointed by the Export Inspection Council for the purpose of examining and approving samples submitted by the exporter;

(4) To prohibit the export in the course of international trade of coir mattings unless the same is accompanied by a certificate issued by any one of the Export Inspection Agencies established under section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), to the effect that the coir mattings conform to the specifications recognised under subparagraph (3) and is exportworthy.

2. Nothing in this notification shall apply to the export by sea, land or air, of samples of coir matting to prospective buyers.

3. In this notification "coir mattings" shall mean and include the following, namely—

(i) Handloom coir mattings.

- (ii) Coir matting mats.
- (iii) Coir matting rugs.
- (iv) Any other sorts of coir mattings.

4. This notification shall come into force on the....
.....February, 1972.

ANNEXURE I

Draft rules proposed to be made under section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963).

1. *Short title and commencement.*—(1) These rules may be called the Export of Coir Mattings (Inspection) Rules, 1972.

(2) They shall come into force on the February, 1972.

2. *Definitions.*—In these rules, unless the context otherwise requires,—

- (a) 'Act' means the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963);
- (b) 'Agency' means the Export Inspection Agencies established at Bombay, Calcutta, Cochin, Delhi and Madras under section 7 of the Act;
- (c) 'Council' means the Export Inspection Council established under section 3 of the Act;
- (d) Coir mattings shall mean and include the following, namely:—
 - (i) Handloom coir mattings.
 - (ii) Coir matting mats
 - (iii) Coir matting rugs.
 - (iv) Any other sorts of coir mattings.

3. *Basis of inspection.*—Inspection of coir mattings intended for export shall be carried out with a view of seeing that the coir mattings conform to the specifications recognised by the Central Government under section 6 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) (hereinafter referred to as the recognised specifications).

4. *Procedure of inspection.*—(1) An exporter intending to export coir mattings shall give an intimation in writing in the prescribed form of his intention so to do to the nearest office of the Export Inspection Agency.

(2) Every intimation for this purpose shall be given not less than seventy two hours before the expected date of shipment.

(3) Before applying for inspection, the exporter shall himself inspect the goods carefully and remove all such goods which do not conform to the recognised specifications.

(4) The goods shall be packed in rolls or bundles and kept ready in packed condition properly stacked in a well lighted place.

(5) The exporter shall provide the necessary facilities to the Inspecting Officer of the Export Inspection Agency for carrying out inspection to ensure that the consignment conforms to the recognised specifications.

(6) The inspection of coir mattings shall be done reference to the recognised specifications of different varieties of coir matting.

5. *Place of inspection.*—The inspection shall be carried out at the premises of the manufacturer or at the premises of the exporter.

6. *Inspection fee.*—A fee at the rate of ten paise for every hundred rupees of the F.O.B. value of such consignment shall be paid as inspection fee for inspection of coir mattings.

7. *Certificate of inspection.*—After satisfying itself that consignment of coir mattings conforms to the recognised specifications and has been sealed in accordance with the instructions issued in this behalf, the Export Inspection Agency shall issue a certificate de-

claring that the consignment conforms to the recognised specifications and is exportworthy.

8. *Appeal.*—(a) Any person aggrieved by the refusal to issue a certificate under rule 8, may within ten days of receipt of the communication of such refusal by him, prefer an appeal to a panel of experts consisting of not less than three persons, appointed for the purpose by the Central Government.

(b) The quorum for the panel shall be three.

(c) The decision of the panel on such appeal shall be final.

ANNEXURE II

Specifications for coir mattings

1. General Requirements:—

1.1. The mattings shall be manufactured from bleached or unbleached coir yarn as agreed to between the buyer and seller. The yarn shall be of two-ply.

1.2. The mattings shall be firmly and evenly woven.

1.3. The mattings shall be plain, dyed or stencilled or may have designs woven into them.

1.4. The mattings may be made into rugs or matting mats as agreed to between the buyer and the seller. In such cases the cut ends of the matting mats or rugs shall either be stitched with suitable cotton thread or bound with jute webbing plain, coloured or fancy or ends doubled back and interlaced in the body of the matting mats or rugs.

1.5. The mattings shall not be loaded with salt or other extraneous matter.

2. Specific Requirements:—

2.1. The mattings of a particular quality number, shall comply with the requirements for that quality number as given in the table or be in accordance with the specifications approved by the panel of experts.

2.2. *Construction.*—The mattings of a particular quality number shall conform to the constructional details for that quality number as given in the Table or be in accordance with the specifications approved by the panel of experts.

2.3. *Ends and Picks.*—The minimum number of warp ends and the number of picks per decimeter (or foot) of matting shall be in accordance with requirements given in the Table or be in accordance with the specifications approved by the panel of experts.

2.4. *Weight.*—The weight per sq. meter (or sq. yard) shall be as specified in the Table or be in accordance with the specifications approved by the panel of experts. A tolerance of ± 7.5 cent in the weight per sq. metre

(sq. yard) shall be permitted.

2.5. *Dimension.*—The dimensions of mattings shall be as specified in the export contract as agreed to between the buyer and the seller. The usual sizes of mattings are given below:—

Dimensions of matting	Mattings width	
	cm	Inches
Size No.		
0	45	18
1	55	22.5
2	60	24
3	70	27
4	90	36
5	115	45
6	140	54
7	160	63
8	180	72
9	270	108
10	—	—

*Mattings are supplied in rolls.

A "Roll" of matting is usually 45m (or 50 yds.) long.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>Three Treadle Weave</i>									
M3A1	ANJENGO	16	35	106	VYCOME/BEACH	11	34	1.58	2.90
M3A2	ANJENGO	15	33	100	VYCOME/BEACH	11	32	1.62	3.00
M3A3	ANJENGO	14	31	93	VYCOME/BEACH	11	32	1.68	3.10
M3A4	ANJENGO	13	29	87	VYCOME/BEACH	10	30	1.75	3.25
M3A5	ANJENGO	12	27	80	VYCOME/BEACH	10	30	1.82	3.40
M3R1	ARATORY	16	35	106	VYCOME/BEACH	11	34	1.50	2.75
M3R2	ARATORY	15	33	100	VYCOME/BEACH	11	32	1.55	2.85
M3R3	ARATORY	14	31	93	VYCOME/BEACH	11	32	1.60	2.95
M3R4	ARATORY	13	29	87	VYCOME/BEACH	10	30	1.68	3.10
M3R5	ARATORY	12	27	80	VYCOME/BEACH	10	30	1.75	3.25
M3C1	ASHTAMUDI	11	24	73	VYCOME/BEACH	9	28	2.08	3.90
M3V1	VYCOME	14	31	93	VYCOME/BEACH	10	30	1.40	2.55
M3V2	VYCOME	13	29	87	VYCOME/BEACH	9	28	1.45	2.65
M3V3	VYCOME	12	27	80	VYCOME/BEACH	9	28	1.52	2.80
M3B1	BEACH	10	22	67	BEACH/KALLAI	9	28	1.40	2.55
<i>Four-Treadle Weave</i>									
M4A1	ANJENGO	15	33	100	VYCOME	13	40	1.70	3.15
M4A2	ANJENGO	14	31	93	VYCOME	13	40	1.75	3.25
M4A3	ANJENGO	13	29	87	VYCOME	13	38	1.82	3.40
M4A4	ANJENGO	12	27	80	VYCOME	13	38	1.90	3.55
M4R1	ARATORY	15	33	100	VYCOME	13	40	1.62	3.00
M4R2	ARATORY	14	31	93	VYCOME	13	40	1.68	3.10
M4R3	ARATORY	13	29	87	VYCOME	13	38	1.75	3.25
M4R4	ARATORY	12	27	80	VYCOME	13	38	1.82	3.40
M4V1	VYCOME	14	31	93	VYCOME	12	36	1.60	2.70
M4V2	VYCOME	13	29	87	VYCOME	12	36	1.55	2.85
M4V3	VYCOME	12	27	80	VYCOME	12	36	1.62	3.00

3. Packing :

- 3.1 The coil mattings shall be packed as agreed to between the buyer and the seller.
- 3.2 Each package shall be marked with the following particulars, namely :
 - (a) Name of the material ;
 - (b) Size ;
 - (c) Number of pieces packed in each package ;
 - (d) Code number of the exporter ;
 - (e) Gross weight; and
 - (f) Name, initials, trade mark or any other identification mark of the exporter.

[No. 6(14)/71-EIEP.]

नई दिल्ली, 22 फरवरी, 1972

क्र० अ० 854.—यतः निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि कयर मैटिंग का निर्यात के पूर्व क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण के अधीन होना चाहिए;

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त प्रयोजन के लिए नीचे विनिर्दिष्ट प्रस्ताव बनाये हैं और उन्हें निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 का नियम 11 के उपनियम (2) द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित, निर्यात निरीक्षण परिपत्र को भेजा है;

अतः अब उक्त उपनियम के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त प्रस्तावों को उससे सम्भाव्यतः प्रभावित होने वाले जन-साधारण की जानकारी के लिए एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करती है।

2. एतद्वारा सूचना दी जाती है कि उक्त प्रस्ताव के बारे में किन्हीं आक्षेप या सुझाव भेजने की वांछा करने वाला कोई व्यक्ति,

उन्हें राजपत्र में इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशन की तारीख से 30 दिन के भीतर निर्यात निरीक्षण परिपत्र, 'वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर', 1411-बी०, इजरा स्ट्रीट (7वीं मंजिल), कलकत्ता-1 को भेज सकता है।

प्रस्ताव

1. (1) यह अधिसूचना करता कि कयर मैटिंग निर्यात के पूर्व क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण के अधीन होंगे :

(2) यह विनिर्दिष्ट करता कि इस अधिसूचना के उपाबन्ध 1 में उपर्युक्त कयर मैटिंग निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1972 के प्रारूप के अनुसार निरीक्षण का प्रकार ऐसे कयर मैटिंग के निर्यात पूर्व निरीक्षण को लागू किया जाने वाला प्रकार हो।

(3) (क) इस अधिसूचना के उपाबन्ध 2 में यथा उपर्युक्त विनिर्देशों का कयर मैटिंग के लिए मानक विनिर्देश के रूप में मान्यता देना।

(ख) उपाबन्ध 2 में यथा उपर्युक्त किन्हीं विनिर्देशों के न होने पर निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा प्रस्तुत किए

गए नमूनों की परीक्षा और अनुसूचन के प्रयोजन के लिए निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद् द्वारा नियुक्त विशेषज्ञों के पैनल द्वारा बनाए गए विनिर्देशों को मान्यता देना।

(4) कयर मैटिंग के अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार के अनुक्रम में निर्यात तब तक प्रतिरोध करना जब तक निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 के अधीन स्थापित निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरणों में से किसी एक अभिकरण द्वारा जारी किया गया इस प्रभाव का प्रमाण-पत्र उसके साथ न हो कि कयर मैटिंग उप-पैरा (3) के अधीन मान्यता प्राप्त विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप हैं और निर्यात योग्य हैं।

2. इस अधिसूचना की कोई भी बात कयर मैटिंग के उन नमूनों को जिनका भावी क्रता की थल, समुद्र या वायु द्वारा निर्यात होता है, लागू नहीं होगी।

3. इस अधिसूचना में 'कयर मैटिंग' के अन्तर्गत निम्नलिखित प्रकार सम्मिलित और अभिप्रेत है, अर्थात्:—

- (1) हाथ करवा कयर मैटिंग।
- (2) कयर मैटिंग मैट
- (3) कयर मैटिंग रग
- (4) किसी भी अन्य प्रकार की कयर मैटिंग।

4. यह अधिसूचनाफरवरी, 1972 से प्रवृत्त होगी

उपबन्ध 1

निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 के अधीन बनाए जाने वाले प्रस्तावित नियमों का प्रारूप।

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ :—(1) इन नियमों का नाम कयर मैटिंग निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1972 होगा।

(2) येफरवरी, 1972 को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. परिभाषाएं:—इन नियमों में, यदि सन्दर्भ से कोई अन्य अर्थ नहीं निकलता है तो :

- (क) 'अधिनियम' से अभिप्रेत है निर्यात (गुण नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22)
- (ख) 'अभिकरण' से अभिप्रेत है अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अन्तर्गत स्थापित बम्बई, कलकत्ता, कोचीन, दिल्ली एवं मद्रास के निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण
- (ग) 'परिषद्' से अभिप्रेत है अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अन्तर्गत स्थापित निर्यात निरीक्षण परिषद्

(घ) "म अधिसूचना में 'कयर मैटिंग' के अन्तर्गत निम्नलिखित प्रकार सम्मिलित और अभिप्रेत हैं, अर्थात्:—

- (1) हाथ करवा कयर मैटिंग
- (2) कयर मैटिंग मैट
- (3) कयर मैटिंग रग
- (4) किसी भी अन्य प्रकार की कयर मैटिंग।

3. निरीक्षण का आधार:—निर्यात के लिए आशयित कयर मैटिंग का निरीक्षण, यह देखने की दृष्टि से कार्यान्वित किया जाएगा कि कयर मैटिंग, निर्यात (गुण नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 6 के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा मान्यताप्राप्त विनिर्देशों (जिन्हें इसमें इसके पश्चात् मान्यताप्राप्त विनिर्देश कहा गया है) के अनुरूप है।

4. निरीक्षण की प्रक्रिया:—(1) कयर मैटिंग का निर्यात करने का आशय रखने वाला निर्यातकर्ता निकटतम निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण के कार्यालय को ऐसा करने के लिए अपने आशय का विहित प्ररूप में लिखित प्रज्ञापन देगा।

(2) इस प्रयोजन के लिए प्रत्येक प्रज्ञापन नामकरण की प्रत्याशित तारीख से 72 घंटे से कम न दिया जाएगा।

(3) निरीक्षण के लिए आवेदन करने के पूर्व निर्यातकर्ता सावधानीपूर्वक स्वयं माल का निरीक्षण करेगा और ऐसे सभी माल, जो मान्यताप्राप्त विनिर्देशों के अनुसार न हो, हटा देगा।

(4) माल रोल या बन्डलों में पैक किया जायेगा और रोशनीपूर्ण स्थान पर उचित रूप से ढेर लगा के पैक की गई दशा में तैयार रखेगा।

(5) निर्यातकर्ता निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण के निरीक्षण अधिकारी को यह सुनिश्चित करने के लिए कि परेपण मान्यताप्राप्त विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप है निरीक्षण कार्यान्वित करने के लिए आवश्यक सुविधाओं की व्यवस्था करेगा।

(6) कयर मैटिंग, का निरीक्षण, कयर मैटिंग, के विभिन्न प्रकार के मान्यताप्राप्त विनिर्देशों के प्रति निर्देश से किया जाएगा।

5. निरीक्षण शुल्क:—निरीक्षण विनिर्माता के परिसर में या निर्यातकर्ता के परिसर में कार्यान्वित किया जाएगा।

6. निरीक्षण फीस:—ऐसे परेपण के पोत-पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के प्रत्येक 100 रु० पर 10 पैसे की दर से फीस कयर मैटिंग, के निरीक्षण के लिए निरीक्षण-फीस के रूप में संदत्त की जाएगी।

7. निरीक्षण का पञ्चाङ्ग-पत्र:—अपना यह समाधान होने के पश्चात् कि कयर मैटिंग, का परेपण मान्यताप्राप्त विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप है और इस निमित्त जारी किए गए अनुदेशों के अनुसार मील लगाया गया है, निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण, यह घोषित करने हुए प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करेगा कि परेपण मान्यताप्राप्त विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप है और निर्यात योग्य है।

8. अपील.—

- (क) नियम 8 के अधीन प्रमाणपत्र जारी करने के इन्कार से व्यथित कोई व्यक्ति उसके द्वारा ऐसे इन्कार की संसूचना की प्राप्ति के 10 दिन के भीतर केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा इस प्रयोजन के लिए नियुक्त तीन व्यक्तियों से अनूयून विशेषज्ञों के पैनल को अपील कर सकेगा।
- (ख) पैनल के लिए गणपूर्ति तीन की होगी।
- (ग) ऐसी अपील पर पैनल (अपील) का विनिश्चय अन्तिम होगा।

उप बन्ध 2

कयर मैटिंग के लिए विनिर्देश

1. साधारण आवश्यकताएं.—

1. 1. क्रेता और विक्रेता के बीच पाये ये करार के अनुसार बिरजित या अवरिजित कयर सूत से मैटिंग का विनिर्माण किया जायेगा।
सूत दो लड़ का होगा।
1. 2. मैटिंग वृद्धता से और एकसा बुना होगा।
1. 3. मैटिंग सादा, रंगीन या बेल बूटे से सजाया हुआ होगा या उनमें बुने हुए डिजाइन हो सकेंगे।
1. 4. मैटिंग जैसा कि क्रेता और विक्रेता के बीच पाये गए करार के अनुसार रंगों में या मैटिंग मैटों में बनाया जा सकेगा। ऐसे मामलों में मैटिंग मैटों या रंगों के कटे हुए छोर उपयुक्त सूत के धागे से सिले जायेंगे या सादे, रंगीन या कैन्सी जूट बेबिंग से बांधे जायेंगे या छोरों को पीछे की ओर दोहरे किये जायेंगे और मैटिंग मैटों और रंगों के मुख्य भाग में अन्तर्घषित किये जायेंगे।
1. 5. मैटिंग की लड़ाई लवण या अन्य भिन्न पदार्थ के साथ नहीं की जायेगी।

2. विनिर्दिष्ट आवश्यकताएं.—

2. 1. विशिष्ट क्वालिटी संख्या के मैटिंग, सारणी में यथा दी गई विशिष्ट क्वालिटी संख्या की आवश्यकताओं के अनुरूप या विशेषज्ञों के पैनल द्वारा अनुमोदित विनिर्देशों के अनुसार होंगे।
2. 2. बनावट.—विशिष्ट क्वालिटी संख्या के मैटिंग सारणी में यथा दी गई उसी क्वालिटी संख्या के लिए बनावट के ०.०० के अनुरूप होंगे या विशेषज्ञों के पैनल द्वारा अनुमोदित विनिर्देशों के अनुसार होंगे।
2. 3. छोर और बाना.—मैटिंग के प्रति डे० मी० (या फुट) के ताना छोरों और बाना धागों की कम से कम संख्या सारणी में दी गई आवश्यकताओं के अनुसार होगी या विशेषज्ञों के पैनल द्वारा अनुमोदित विनिर्देशों के अनुसार होगी।

2. 4. भार.—प्रति व० मी० (या व० गज) भार सारणी में यथा विनिर्दिष्ट या विशेषज्ञों के पैनल द्वारा अनुमोदित विनिर्देशों के अनुसार होगा। प्रति व० मी० (या व० गज) में ± 7.5 प्रतिशत की गुंजाइश अनुज्ञात होगी।

—5.0

2. 5. आयाम.—मैटिंग के आयाम निर्यात-संविदा में विनिर्दिष्ट क्रेता और विक्रेता के बीच पाये गये करार के अनुसार होंगे। मैटिंग के प्राथिक आकार नीचे दिये गये हैं :—

मैटिंग के आयाम

आकार सं०	+ मैटिंग की चौड़ाई	
	से० मी०	इंच
0	45	18
1	55	22.5
2	60	24
3	70	27
4	90	36
5	113	45
6	140	54
7	160	63
8	180	72
9	270	108
10	—	—

+ मैटिंग रोल में प्रदाय किया जायेंगा।

—मैटिंग का 'रोल' प्राथिक रूप से 45 मी० (या 50 गज) लम्बा होता है।

जब तक विनिर्दिष्टतः अन्यथा करार न किया गया हो, आयाम में निम्नलिखित गुंजाइश अनुज्ञात होगी :

कयर मैटिंग—लम्बाई— ± 1 प्रतिशत180 से० मी० (71 इंच) \pm तक चौड़ाई के लिए

—

 ± 13 मि० मी० (112 इंच)

180 से० मी० (71 इंच) से

अधिक चौड़ाई के लिए ± 25 मि० मी० (1 इंच)

कवार मैटिंग रग लम्बाई -- ± 13 मि०मी० (11 2 इंच)चीड़ाई -- ± 13 मि०मी० (11 2 इंच)

सारणी

हाथ-करघा कयर मैटिंग के बनावट के व्यौरे

कवालिटी सं०	ताना				बाना		भार		
	सूत की क्वालिटी	सूत का लगभग स्कोरेज	छोर प्रति डे०मी०	कम से कम प्रति फुट	सूत की क्वालिटी	बाना प्रति डे०मी०	कम से कम फुट	कि या०/पाउंड/मी०	याइ
1	2 -	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
बो ट्रेड्स सादी बुनाई :									
एम 2 ए 1	अंजेलो	15	33	100	वायकोम/बीच	11	32	1.50	2.75
एम 2 ए 2	अंजेलो	14	31	93	वायकोम/बीच	11	32	1.55	2.85
एम 2 ए 3	अंजेलो	13	29	87	वायकोम/बीच	10	30	1.62	3.00
एम 2 ए 4	अंजेलो	12	27	80	वायकोम/बीच	9	28	1.70	3.15
एम 2 आर 1	आरटोरी	15	33	100	वायकोम/बीच	11	32	1.42	2.60
एम 2 आर 2	आरटोरी	14	31	93	वायकोम/बीच	11	32	1.60	2.70
एम 2 आर 3	आरटोरी	13	29	87	वायकोम/बीच	10	30	1.55	2.85
एम 2 आर 4	आरटोरी	12	27	80	वायकोम/बीच	9	28	1.62	3.00
एम 2 बी 1	वायकोम	15	33	100	कलीकत/बीच वायकोम	9	28	1.35	2.45
एम 2 बी 2	वायकोम	14 11 3	30	90	यथोक्त	9	28	1.42	2.60
एम 2 बी 3	वायकोम	12	27	80	यथोक्त	9	28	1.50	2.80
एम 2 बी 1	बीच	11 11 10	23	70	बीच/कल्लाई	9	28	1.30	2.35
एम 2 बी 2	बीच	9	20	60	बीच/कल्लाई	9	28	1.40	2.14
हा ट्रेड्स बास्कट बुनाई :									
एम 2 बी ए 1 (3×2)	अंजेलो	15	30	90	अंजेलो/आरटोरी	17	50	1.72	3.20
एम बी ए 2 (3×2)	अंजेलो	14	28	84	अंजेलो/आरटोरी	17	50	1.77	3.30
एम बी ए 3 (3×2)	अंजेलो	13	26	78	अंजेलो/आरटोरी	16	48	1.82	3.40
एम 2 बी ए 4 (3×2)	अंजेलो	15	30	90	वायकोम	17	50	1.62	3.00
एम 2 बी ए 5 (3×2)	अंजेलो	14	28	84	वायकोम	17	50	1.68	3.10
एम 2 बी ए 6 (3×2)	अंजेलो	13	26	78	वायकोम	16	48	1.72	3.20
एम 2 बी आर (3×2)	आरटोरी	15	30	90	आरटोरी	17	50	1.68	3.10

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
एम 2 बी आर 2 (3×2)	आरटोरी	14	28	84	आरटोरी	17	50	1.72	3.20
एम 2 बी आर 3 (3×2)	आरटोरी	13	26	78	आरटोरी	16	48	1.78	3.30
एम 2 बी आर 4 (3×2)	आरटोरी	15	30	90	वायकोम	17	50	1.58	2.90
एम 2 बी आर 5 (3×2)	आरटोरी	14	28	84	वायकोम	17	50	1.62	2.00
एम 2 बी आर 6 (3×2)	आरटोरी	13	26	78	वायकोम	16	48	1.68	3.10
एम 2 बी बी 1 (3×2)	वायकोम	14	28	84	वायकोम	16	48	1.48	2.70
एम 2 बी बी 2 (3×2)	वायकोम	13	26	78	वायकोम	16	48	1.52	2.80
एम 2 बी बी 3 (3×2)	वायकोम	12	24	73	वायकोम	15	46	1.58	2.90
एम 2 बी बी 1 (3×2)	बीच	10	20	60	बीच	15	44	1.38	2.50
तीन ट्रेडल बुवाई									
एम 3 ए 1	एजेन्गो	16	35	106	वायकोम/बीच	11	34	1.58	2.90
एम 3 ए 2	एजेन्गो	15	33	100	वायकोम/बीच	11	32	1.62	3.00
एम 3 ए 3	अजेन्गो	14	31	93	वायकोम/बीच	11	32	1.68	3.10
एम 3 ए 4	अजेन्गो	13	29	87	वायकोम/बीच	10	30	1.75	3.25
एम 3 ए 5	अजेन्गो	12	27	80	वायकोम/बीच	10	30	1.82	3.40
एम 3 आर 1	आरटोरी	16	35	106	वायकोम/बीच	11	34	1.50	2.75
एम 3 आर 2	आरटोरी	15	33	100	वायकोम/बीच	11	32	1.55	2.85
एम 3 आर 3	आरटोरी	14	31	93	वायकोम/बीच	11	32	1.60	2.95
एम 3 आर 4	आरटोरी	13	29	87	वायकोम/बीच	10	30	1.68	3.10
एम 3 आर 5	आरटोरी	12	27	80	वायकोम/बीच	10	30	1.75	3.25
एम 3 सी 1	अष्टमूडीय	11	24	73	वायकोम/बीच	9	28	2.08	3.90
एम 3 बी 1	वायकोम	14	31	93	वायकोम/बीच	10	30	1.40	2.55
एम 3 बी 2	वायकोम	13	29	87	वायकोम/बीच	9	28	1.45	2.65
एम 3 बी 3	वायकोम	12	27	80	वायकोम/बीच	9	28	1.52	2.80
एम 3 बी 1	बीच	10	22	67	बीच/कल्लाई	9	28	1.40	2.55

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
चार ड्रेडल बुनाई :									
एम 4 ए 1	अजेन्लो	15	33	100	वायकोम	13	40	1.70	3.15
एम 4 ए 2	अजेन्लो	14	31	93	वायकोम	13	40	1.75	3.25
एम 4 ए 3	अजेन्लो	13	29	87	वायकोम	13	38	1.82	3.40
एम 4 ए 4	अजेन्लो	12	27	80	वायकोम	13	38	1.90	3.55
एम 4 आर 1	आरटोरी	15	33	100	वायकोम	13	40	1.62	3.00
एम 4 आर 2	आरटोरी	14	31	93	वायकोम	13	40	1.68	3.10
एम 4 आर 3	आरटोरी	13	29	87	वायकोम	13	38	1.75	3.25
एम 4 आर 4	आरटोरी	12	27	80	वायकोम	13	38	1.82	3.40
एम 4 बी 1	वायकोम	14	31	93	वायकोम	12	36	1.60	2.70
एम 4 बी 2	वायकोम	13	29	87	वायकोम	12	36	1.55	2.85
एम 4 बी 3	वायकोम	12	27	80	वायकोम	12	36	1.62	3.00

3. पैकिंग : —

3.1 कयर मैटिंग श्रेता और विक्रेता के बीच यथा पाये गये करार के अनुसार पैक किये जायेंगे ।

3.2 प्रत्येक पैकेज निम्नलिखित विशिष्टियों से चिह्नित किया जायेगा, अर्थात्:—

(क) सामग्री का नाम :

(ख) आकार :

(ग) प्रत्येक पैकेज में पैक किये गये नगों की संख्या :

(घ) निर्यातकर्ताओं की कोड संख्या :

(ङ) कुल भार : और

(च) निर्यातकर्ता का नाम, अक्षांश, व्यापार चिह्न या कोई अन्य पहचान-चिह्न ।

[सं० 6 (14)/71-ई० आई० ई० पी०]

S.O. 855.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Export of Coir, Products (Inspection), Rules, 1965, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Coir Products (Inspection) second Amendment Rules, 1972,

(2) They shall come into force on 1st March, 1972.

2. In the Export of Coir Products (Inspection) Rules, 1965, for rule 5A the following rule shall be substituted, namely:—

“5A. *Inspection fee.*—A fee at the rate of fifteen paise for each bundle shall be paid as inspection fee for inspection of coir products.”

[No. 6(5)/71-EIEP.]

नई दिल्ली, 23 फरवरी, 1972

का० आ० 855.—निर्यात (गुण नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त

शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार कयर उत्पाद के निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1965 में आगे संशोधन करने के लिए, एतद्वारा निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है; अर्थात्:—

1. (1) ये नियम कयर उत्पाद के निर्यात (निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1972 कहे जा सकेंगे ।

(2) वे 1 मार्च, 1972 को प्रवृत्त होंगे ।

2. कयर उत्पाद के निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1965 में नियम 5क के स्थान पर निम्नोक्त नियम प्रतिस्थापित किया जायेगा:—

“5क. निरीक्षण फीस.—कयर उत्पादों के निरीक्षण के लिए निरीक्षण फीस के रूप में प्रत्येक बंडल पर पन्द्रह पैसे की दर से फीस संदत्त की जायेगी ।”

[सं० 6(5)/71-ई०आई०ई०पी०]

S.O. 856.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Export of Coir Yarn (Inspection) Rules, 1966, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Coir Yarn (Inspection) second Amendment Rules, 1972.

(2) They shall come into force on 1st March, 1972.

2. In the Export of Coir Yarn (Inspection) Rules, 1966, for rule 7A the following rule shall be substituted, namely:

"7A. *Inspection fee.*—A fee at the rate of thirty paise for each bale shall be paid as inspection fee for inspection of coir yarn."

[No. 6(5)/71-EIEP.

M. K. B. BHATNAGAR,

Dy. Director (Export Promotion).

का० आ० 856.—निर्यात (गुण नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, कयर धागा निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1966 में आगे संशोधन करने के लिए, एतद्द्वारा निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है; अर्थात्—

1. (1) ये नियम कयर धागा निर्यात (निरीक्षण) द्वितीय संशोधन नियम, 1972 कहे जा सकेंगे।

(2) वे 1 मार्च, 1972 को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. कयर धागा निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1966 के नियम 7क के स्थान पर निम्नोक्त नियम प्रतिस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात् :—

"7क निरीक्षण फीस.—कयर धागे के निरीक्षण के लिए निरीक्षण फीस के रूप में प्रत्येक गांठ पर तीन पैसे की दर से फीस संदत्त की जायेगी।"

[सं० 6(5)/71-ई०आई०ई०पी०]

एम० के० बी० भटनागर,

उप-निदेशक (निर्यात संवर्धन)।

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(P. & T. Board)

New Delhi, the 19th February 1972

S.O. 857.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sections 46 and 74 of the Indian Post Office Act, 1898 (6 of 1898), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Indian Post Office Rules, 1933, namely:—

(1) These rules may be called the Indian Post Office (Twentyfirst Amendment) Rules, 1971.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

(3) In the Indian Post Office Rules, 1933;

(1) in rule 145, in clause (b) of sub-rule (1) for the word "sterling" the word "foreign currency" shall be substituted.

(2) in rule 146,

(i) for sub-rule (2) the following sub-rule shall be substituted, namely;

"(2) The amount for which a single foreign currency money order may be issued or the total amount for which a single remitter may obtain such money order in one day shall be limited to £40 or its equivalent in any other foreign currency or Indian currency or such smaller sum as may in the case of remittances to any particular country or countries be specially notified by the Director General. In the event of foreign currency money orders exceeding the prescribed limit in aggregate being accepted by a post office or offices in India from a single remitter in one day, only such money order or money orders as do not exceed that limit shall be advised to destination and the value of the remaining money order or money orders as actually paid in Indian currency at the time of issue shall be repaid to the remitter who shall not however be granted a refund of the commission paid by him in respect of such money orders. No foreign currency money order shall include any fraction of a pence or fraction of any other smaller practical unit of currency concerned.

(ii) in sub-rule (3), for the word "sterling" the word "currency" shall be substituted,

(3) in rule (150)

in sub-rule (1) for the word "sterling", the word "currency" shall be substituted,

(4) for rule 152 the following rule shall be substituted namely:—

"152. Foreign money orders expressed in foreign currencies received for payment in India shall be paid as if they were inland money orders, the amount in foreign currencies of the original money orders being converted into rupee currency by the Indian post office of exchange concerned, at such rate of exchange as the Director-General may, from time to time, direct."

(5) in rule 153 for the word "sterling", the word "currency" shall be substituted,

(6) for rule 154, the following rule shall be substituted namely:—

"154. Under no circumstances can a foreign money order, be paid after it has been treated as void or returned to the country of issue."

(7) in rule 157, for the word "sterling" wherever it occurs the words "foreign currency" shall be substituted.

[No. 42/8/71-CF.]

K. R. MURTHY,

Director (Mails).

संचार विभाग

(डाक तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 19 फरवरी, 1972

का० आ० 857.—भारतीय डाकघर अधिनियम, 1898 (1898 का 6) की धारा 46 तथा 74 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय डाकघर नियम 1933 में और आगे संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम एतद्द्वारा बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

(1) इन नियमों का नाम भारतीय डाकघर (इक्कीसवां संशोधन) नियम, 1971 होगा।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

(3) भारतीय डाकघर नियम, 1933 में,

(1) नियम 145 में, उपनियम (1) के खण्ड (ख) में "स्टलिंग" शब्द के स्थान पर "विदेशी करेन्सी" शब्द प्रतिस्थापित किये जायेंगे।

(2) नियम 146 में (I) उप-नियम (2) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उप-नियम प्रतिस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात् :—

"(2) वह रकम जिसके लिए एकल विदेशी करेन्सी मनीआर्डर जारी किया जा सकेगा या वह कुल रकम जिसके लिए एकल विप्रेषक ऐसे मनीआर्डर को एक दिन में अभिप्राप्त कर सकेगा, 40 पौण्ड या किसी अन्य विदेशी करेन्सी या भारतीय करेन्सी में उसके समतुल्य, या ऐसी जघुतर रकम तक सीमित होगी, जो किसी विशिष्ट देश या देशों की विप्रेषणों की दशा में महानिदेशक द्वारा विनिश्चित: अधिसूचित की जाये। एक दिन में एकल विप्रेषक से भारत में डाकघर या डाकघरों द्वारा स्वीकार किये जाने वाले योग में विहित सीमा से अधिक विदेशी करेन्सी मनीआर्डरों की दशा में, केवल ऐसे मनीआर्डर या मनीआर्डरों को, जो उस सीमा से अधिक न हों, गन्तव्य स्थान पर भेजा जायेगा और बाकी मनीआर्डर या मनीआर्डरों का मूल्य, जो वास्तविक रूप से जारी करते समय भारतीय करेन्सी में संवत्त किया गया था, विप्रेषक को पुनः संदत्त किया जायेगा, किन्तु उसे ऐसे मनीआर्डरों की बावत उसके द्वारा संदत्त कमिशन को लौटाया नहीं जायेगा। किसी भी विदेशी करेन्सी मनीआर्डर में फस या संबंधित करेन्सी के कितने अन्य लघुतर मथार्थ यूनिट का भाग सम्मिलित नहीं होगा।

(ii) उप-नियम (3) में "स्टलिंग" शब्द के स्थान पर "करेन्सी" शब्द प्रतिस्थापित किया जायेगा,

(3) नियम 150 में—

उपनियम (1) में "स्टलिंग" शब्द के स्थान पर "करेन्सी" शब्द प्रतिस्थापित किया जायेगा,

(4) नियम 152 के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित नियम प्रतिस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात् :—

'152' भारत में संदाय के लिए प्राप्त विदेशी करेन्सी में अभिव्यक्त विदेशी मनीआर्डर संबंधित विनियम भारतीय डाकघर द्वारा ऐसे विनियम की दर पर जसा महानिदेशक समय-समय पर निदेश दे, मूल मनीआर्डरों की विदेशी करेन्सी में की रकम रुपया करेन्सी में परिवर्तित करके संदत्त किये जायेंगे मानो वे अन्तर्देशीय मनीआर्डर हों।"

(5) नियम 153 में 'स्टलिंग' शब्द के स्थान पर 'करेन्सी' शब्द प्रतिस्थापित किया जायेगा,

(6) नियम 154 के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित नियम प्रतिस्थापित किया जायेगा, अर्थात् :—

"154 किन्हीं भी परिस्थितियों में कोई विदेशी मनीआर्डर उसके शून्य समझने या भुजने वाले देश को वापस करने के पश्चात् संदत्त नहीं किया जा सकेगा।"

(.) नियम 157 में, 'स्टलिंग' शब्द, जहां कहीं भी वह आता हो, के स्थान पर 'विदेशी करेन्सी' शब्द प्रतिस्थापित किये जायेंगे ;

[सं० 42/8/71-सी० एक.]

क० आर० मति,
निदेशक (पेल)।

(P. & T. Board)

New Delhi, the 21st February 1972

S.O. 858.—The Director General, Posts and Telegraphs hereby specifies that with effect from 1st April, 1972 the following Telephone Exchanges in Andhra Circle of P. & T. Department will be renamed as shown against each exchange:—

Existing name	Proposed name
1. SHAKKAR NAGAR	BODHAN
2. WANPARTHI ROAD	MADANAPURAM

[No. 25-5/72-PHB.]

(डाक-तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 21 फरवरी, 1972

का० आ० 858.—डाक-तार महानिदेशक यह घोषणा करते हैं कि 1-4-1972 से डाक-तार विभाग के आन्ध्र सर्कल के निम्नलिखित टेलीफोन एक्सचेंजों के नाम बदल कर उनके सामने अंकित नाम रखे जायेंगे

वर्तमान प्रस्तावित नाम

1. शक्कर नगर	बोधन
2. वानपार्थी रोड	मदनपुरम

[सं० 25-5/72-पी एच बी]

S.O. 859.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 16th March, 1972 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Clement Town, Prem Nagar and Rajpur Telephone Exchanges, U.P. Circle, which are part of Dehradun Exchange System.

[No. 5-2/72-PHB(4).]

क्रा० आ० 859.—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किये गये भारतीय तार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने उत्तर प्रदेश संचालक के लेमेन्टाउन, प्रेम नगर और राजपुर टेलीफोन केंद्रों में जो कि देहरादून एक्सचेंज प्रणाली के भाग हैं, दिनांक 16-3-72 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[सं० 5-2/72-पी एच बी (4)]

New Delhi, the 24th February 1972

S.O. 860.—In pursuance of Para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 16th March, 1972 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in GIRIDIH Telephone Exchange, Bihar Circle.

[No. 5-14/72-PHB(4)]

नई दिल्ली, 24 फरवरी, 1972

क्रा० आ० 860.—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किये गये भारतीय तार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने गिरिडीह टेलीफोन केंद्र में दिनांक 16-3-72 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[संख्या 5-14/72-पी एच बी (4)]

S.O. 861.—In pursuance of Para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 16th March, 1972 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Ayodhya Telephone Exchange, U.P. Circle in the local area of Faizabad Telephone System.

[No. 5-7/72-PHB(13)]

D. R. BAHL,
Assistant Director General (PHB)

क्रा० आ० 861.—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किये गये भारतीय तार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खंड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने फैजाबाद टेलीफोन प्रणाली के स्थानीय क्षेत्र में अयोध्या टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज, उत्तर प्रदेश संचालक में दिनांक 16-3-72 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[सं० 5-7/72-पी एच बी (13)]

डी० आर० बहल,
महायक महानिदेशक (पी०एच०बी०)।